The Journal of Historical Review

VOLUME FIVE, NUMBER ONE / SPRING 1984

Toward History by Willis A. Carto

The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within a Myth
by Friedrich P. Berg

'Der Auschwitz Mythos': A Book and Its Fate
by Wilhelm Staeglich

Karl Marx: Anti-Semite by James B. Whisker

Hitler, the Unemployed and Autarky by Rudolf Jordan

BOOK REVIEWS: Charles Lutton on *Stalin's Secret War* and *Pawns of Yalta* • Keith Stimely on *Das Fuehrerhauptquartier 1939-1945* and *Die Grosse Zeit des Deutschen Films 1933-1945* • Mark Weber on *The Priority of N.C. Paulescu in the Discovery of Insulin*

Keith Stimely, *Editor*

EDITORIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

WALTER B. ALLENDE, Ph.D.
University of Buenos Aires
Buenos Aires, Argentina

AUSTIN J. APP, Ph.D.
La Salle College (Ret.)
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

GEORGE ASHLEY, Ph.D.
Los Angeles Unified School District
History Instructor

JOHN BENNETT
Victoria Council for Civil Liberties
Melbourne, Australia

ARTHUR R. BUTZ, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

ROBERT FAURISSON, Ph.D.
University of Lyon-2
Lyon, France

EITTLIEB FELDERER
Revisionist History Magazine
Toby, Sweden

PERCY L. GREAVES, Jr.
Free Market Books
Dobbs Ferry, New York

SAMUEL E. KONKIN III
The New Libertarian
Long Beach, California

MARTIN A. LARSON, Ph.D.
The Spotlight
Washington, D.C.

WILLIAM B. LINDSEY, Ph.D.
Research Chemist

JAMES J. MARTIN, Ph.D.
Ralph Myles Publishers
Colorado Springs, Colorado

REVILO P. OLIVER, Ph.D.
University of Illinois (Ret.)
Urbana, Illinois

WILHELM STAEGLICH, Dr. Jur. (Ret.)
Badenweiler, West Germany

UDO WALENDY, Dipl. Pol.
Verlag fuer Volkstum und
Zeitgeschichtsforschung
Vlotho/Weser, West Germany

CHARLES E. WEBER, Ph.D.
University of Tulsa (Ret.)
Tulsa, Oklahoma

ANDREAS R. WESSERLE, Ph.D.
Marquette University (Ret.)
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

The Journal of Historical Review is published quarterly by the Institute for Historical Review, Post Office Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505. Subscriptions include the *IHR Newsletter*, an eventful journal of interest to academic and lay historical revisionists, issued eight times per year on the alternate months of issue of *The Journal of Historical Review*. Combined subscription price is $30 per year, $50 for two years, and $70 for three years. Add $10 per year for domestic first class delivery. Add $5 per year for foreign subscriptions. Add $15 per year for overseas airmail delivery. Remittances for subscriptions must be payable in U.S. dollars. Add $5 if funds are drawn on a non-U.S. bank. Quantity subscription and bulk issue rates are available on request. Appropriate manuscripts are welcomed by the editor, and must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1983
PTLA Catalog
EBSCO Librarians Handbook

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made prior to printing, and also providing that the following attribution appears with the article:

Reprinted by permission of *The Journal of Historical Review*, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: $30 per year.

Two copies of each printing should be submitted to the Editor of *The Journal of Historical Review*.

Contents

Toward History 7
Willis A. Carto

The Diesel Gas Chambers:
Myth Within A Myth 15
Friedrich P. Berg

'Der Auschwitz Mythos':
A Book and Its Fate 47
Wilhelm Staeglich

Karl Marx: Anti-Semite 69
James B. Whisker

Hitler, the Unemployed
and Autarky 77
Rudolf Jordan

Review Article—
Stalin's War: Victims
and Accomplices 84
Charles Lutton

Book Reviews 95

News and Comment 106

About the Contributors 128

A Note From The Editor

In 1979 a group of 34 French historians, reacting to the first discomfitures caused by Professor Robert Faurisson's investigations of the World War II "gas chambers" allegation, published a declaration in *Le Monde* which contained these sentences:

> . . . . It is not necessary to ask how *technically* such mass murder was possible. It was possible, seeing that it took place. That is the required point of departure of every historical inquiry on this subject. This truth it behooves us to remember in simple terms: *there is not and there cannot be a debate about the existence of* the gas chambers.

Indeed it seems there cannot—if the story of the gas chambers is to remain accepted as a historical fact. The 34 French historians, one may well suppose, know exactly what they were saying and why they had to say it, though theirs was an extraordinary step. In fact this is an understatement: coming from *historians* it was and is nothing less than mind-boggling. But then these historians faced a quite mind-boggling problem.

It remains a problem, graver for them now than ever—since the debate about the gas chambers, far from ceasing at the stroke of 34 pens, has proceeded with vigor. A good part of it in America has been conducted in the pages of this journal. The detailed *technical* ("commands" from on high notwithstanding) investigations of the alleged gas chambers and gassing processes presented in past issues by Dr. Faurisson and by Dr. William Lindsey have done much to clarify the issue of the role of *Zyklon B*, the deadly hydrocyanic acid supposedly *used by the Germans to murder millions* in the Auschwitz gas chambers. Because of their work we (and 34 French historians in spite of themselves; they probably *don't* actually put their hands over their eyes) now know much more about the chemical/physical properties of Zyklon B, the conditions necessary for its use, the precautions that must be taken by its users in any application, the purpose for which it was manufactured and used, the various possibilities and impossibilities relating to its application, and so forth. Most importantly for broad-historical purposes, we know from all this *how to approach and judge* many and various claims about Zyklon B that have been made in connection with the "Holocaust" story, and that do constitute a very important part of that story.

But as Friedrich P. Berg reminds us in this issue's feature article, "The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within A Myth," the Zyklon B claims, important as they are, constitute only a *part* of the story: in fact, as they relate to the total numbers of alleged victims, about one-half the story. According to the legend as it has coalesced and been presented by its most careful and serious proponents, in the majority of the great killing centers other than Auschwitz, as well as in the various "mobile" killing installations, the victims were gassed to death not with cyanidic Zyklon B, but with carbon monoxidic *Diesel fuel exhaust*. Mr. Berg's highly

technical investigation here is the first such to be carried out on *this* question in any forum—and, for that matter, on any side in the "Holocaust" controversy. It is a breakthrough. The author's intimate familiarity, as a professional engineer and environmental consultant, with the chemical/physical properties of Diesel fuel exhaust and the range of its effects on human beings qualifies him well for a study which no historian of the "Holocaust" has undertaken in any depth but which will henceforth bear the most serious consideration by all such historians (of the serious variety).

It is in some ways an odd piece to appear in a historical journal. Basically a treatise on engineering and chemistry principles and a presentation of empirical data (with, however, the historical context and import made very clear at outset and end), one might expect—if it related to anything other than the "Holocaust" issue with its still-efficacious taboos—that it would appear first in a scientific journal. That is the way things usually happen when a non-historian specialist comes up with conclusions in his discipline which have a larger, historical, bearing: his or her paper will appear in a specialist journal, from there the conclusions will be picked up by and filter down into the consciousness of historians, and will then further filter down, perhaps with refinements and caveats, to students, into books, and thus to the history-reading lay populace—the whole process being the working-out in practice of the truth that history, which is all-embracing, is thus also interdisciplinarian. In this case, however, such are the constraints involved in *any* critical discussion of the "Holocaust," almost anywhere, that Mr. Berg's research debuts in this historical journal, which does not suffer under those constraints, for the consideration at the outset of the widest possible audience. A usual step has thus been bypassed, to no harm at all and perhaps some benefit. If the lay historical reader finds parts of the article heavy going—Mr. Berg not having been content to present his conclusions without *demonstrating* in detail the scientific bases for them—nevertheless its presentation here, first, can only hasten in welcome fashion the injection of the issues it raises into the dialogue of the historians.

That dialogue will go on no matter what arbitrary limitations, either of subject or method, are proposed for it—even by members of the guild. *Curiosity* plain and simple, the fundamental motive behind all historical inquiry (and as such never, never to be disparaged) will see to that. Those who propose "no debate" on the gas chambers fight a losing battle *even against themselves*. They have, without too much thought, locked themselves in to the diesel exhaust story, as the Zyklon B story. They above all should be most interested in reading dissenting research which may help to tell them whether theirs was a wise move or not. Some will doubtless struggle to unlock themselves—and as Mr. Berg points out in the "Postscript" to his article, there are signs that this is *already* happening to a degree. Others will throw away the key and prepare for a last-ditch stand. It is most likely that these latter will, in dealing with Mr. Berg's investigation and its implications for their position, use a tactic well-honed indeed in application against Robert Faurisson. This simple tactic, whose effectiveness should not be under-

rated, is to say that: the revisionists of the "Holocaust" are *obscurantists*, they focus on as many little, separate technical details as they can—so as to obscure the broader picture; they draw outrageous, unwarranted *general* conclusions from their specific investigations; they *confuse* intentionally with a *mass of impressive but irrelevant data*; they know they can't topple the whole story head-on, and so they peck away here and there at matters which are not so important. "Debating" these people is to add an unwarranted legitimacy to their approach, which is *fallacious and dangerous*.

It is, as a matter of fact, entirely possible that a broad historical reality may suffer unwarranted distortion at the hands of a too-technical, too-detailed approach. The scientific method, though it can help historical inquiry, cannot *be* the historical method itself—at least in dealing with human history, which is often a record of irrationality, illogicality and quirkiness defying the precise analysis which the scientist likes to bring to bear. This point made, however, it remains for any explorers of the "Holocaust" to determine for themselves whether the revisionist focus on *the details of the gas chambers and the gassing processes* is not indeed quite warranted and quite relevant. Such a determination must rest on an acknowledgement that the "Holocaust" story is based on *definite, specific, physical, material* claims, and no matter the great metaphysical, metahistorical—even theological—adornments placed on it in the fashion so widespread today, this simple physical core remains. Thus, in fact, there can really be only one determination here; it has been made already by the upholders of the "Holocaust" story and this, it does not take a genius to figure out, is the *very reason why* some of them proclaim: "no debate."

The American historian Lucy S. Dawidowicz has said approvingly of the declaration by the 34 French historians that it "could well serve as a guide to American historians." But it must be wondered how many American historians will actually wish to subscribe to a statement which contains the words "*It is not necessary to ask . . .*" What enormous implications: "*It is not necessary to ask . . .*" These are incredible, even frightening, words, and historians who would subscribe to them clearly took a wrong turn somewhere in life and wound up in the wrong profession.

That profession will likely withstand such assaults against it from within—and continue to welcome and give due consideration to the contributions of others from without. Its own very simple, and very magnificent, guiding truth has, after all, ever been that it is "necessary to ask"—and to answer, no matter where the answers might lead[.]

—*Keith Stimely*

Toward History

W.A. CARTO

(Paper presented to the 1983 International Revisionist Conference)

I have always thought that Henry Ford's concise definition of history sets forth more wisdom in fewer words than anything else I know. He observed, "History is bunk," and in three short words the great populist industrialist spelled out one of the most profound problems of our time.

We have to recognize that when Ford said that history is bunk he was referring to history as related by the Establishment; he was not speaking of history as it should be. And because you are here tonight I am sure that you must agree with his profundity: the history we are given by the Establishment is, indeed, bunk; that's literally the best we can say of it.

Now this is a sad but a very real fact. Of course, it doesn't have to be that way. History need not be bunk. History can be true and a positive force for society. And so we come to the mission of the Institute for Historical Review—to bring history into accord with the facts.

We meet this weekend at the Fifth International Revisionist Conference. The Institute for Historical Review is entering its sixth year. We have completed but five years. That's a very brief time, five years. A very short time and a very massive job. Moreover, a job undertaken in the teeth of a veritable firestorm of hatred and opposition, with our survival more than once in serious doubt. And for what it may be worth I would like to

assure everyone—those who may be pleased as well as those who may not—that there is no longer any question about our survival.

So we have ample reason to be proud of what we have done. But before we become too pleased with ourselves let me remind you that what we have done is very small in relation to what yet needs to be done.

We have been accused by some critics of wanting to rewrite the history books. Apparently, this is a great sin, to want to rewrite history books. In fact, we have even been sued for daring to challenge "established historical fact"! I must admit that our critics and the gentleman who has sued us are right. We do seek to rewrite the history books. We do aim to bring history into accord with the facts. We do object to propaganda as history; to history created for the benefit of the greedy pressure groups which control our country and our destiny, which is another way of saying that we object to being force-fed history as a weapon or a tool—history written for the purpose of subjecting and enslaving us.

It is self-evident that men can be free only insofar as they know the truth. The opposite is also true: when all that men know are purposeful lies, or if they are forced to pretend that lies they know very well to be lies are true, then they are slaves to that extent. And if you are unaware that slavery is the exact condition for us which our betters are aiming for, then you are not prepared for 1984.

In our conferences as well as in our journal we have dealt with many subjects. It is not difficult to find subjects which have been used as propaganda ploys by the Establishment. The subject which has caused the most interest and which has gotten us into the hottest water is, of course, the so-called "Holocaust."

Our opponents, who have literally billions of dollars riding on the continued embellishment and exploitation of the "Holocaust" lie, have frantically tried to stop us. The Establishment needs to prevent questioning of this myth. To their dismay they have failed to stop us and today one would have to be an illiterate hermit not to be aware that many intellectuals now are questioning what only a few years ago was ironclad dogma.

Today there are numerous books taking issue with the claims of the exterminationists, the latest being the brand-new title just brought out by the Institute: *The Dissolution of Eastern European Jewry*, by Walter Sanning. This book presents the final solution to all of the exterminationists' claims made for the last 40 years. Specifically and in detail it answers the question: If the Nazis didn't gas six million Jews, what happened to them?.

Remember that the number of people who have read Dr. Arthur Butz's great work, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, or

Paul Rassinier's ground-breaking writings, or Robert Faurisson's lectures, or Judge Staeglich's masterpiece, or Walter Sanning's new book, or Ditlieb Felderer's essays, are tiny in comparison to the numbers we are trying to influence. But note this: every day, every hour, the books and literature we have circulating out there in the countryside are reaching someone new; the efforts made to stifle the news that the so-called "Holocaust" is a malicious lie will, in the long run, only guarantee the triumph of this fact.

The point is, we seem to have covered all of the ground we need to in order to prove our point. Facts, once discovered and put in the form of readily-available books and literature, are permanent. And we will not rest until our books are in every public and school library in the country and are familiar to everyone interested in the subject. In regard to the so-called "Holocaust," our need now is to double and redouble the dissemination of the available literature, not to produce new writings on the subject.

It is time for revisionists to delve even deeper into the hidden causes of the travail and misery humankind has experienced in this socially retarded age, which—the Establishment, in good Orwellian style, never tires of telling us—is an era far advanced from the bad old days. It is now time for the Institute to help lay the groundwork for an integrated theory of history to explain what is really happening to us in this confusing and deceptive age.

If Henry Ford said that history is bunk, another perceptive observer I admire had an entirely different definition and he, too, was right. Francis Parker Yockey said that politics is activity in relation to power, and if we are now speaking of what history should be, rather than what the Establishment has perverted it into, we must admit that history is the chronicle of that activity.

To be a real historian one must focus on the significant facts. A history of fashion design may be scrupulously accurate and may have value for certain people or groups but it is not what I would call significant history. So it is with the history of copper mining, penal institutions, the eucalyptus tree or black Africa, ad infinitum.

Obviously, the writers of such histories as I have just mentioned can make no claim to have produced a record of activity in relation to power. But perhaps it is not so obvious to see that even a history of military engagements or of diplomatic correspondence or public and even private statements of political leaders may not be the sort of activity in relation to power which, when chronicled, permits us to perceive the causal reality behind the smokescreen of events.

Merely remembering dates and names and numbers does not a responsible historian make. Such so-called historians are analo-

gous to the famous moron who could, as a freight train passed by, remember the serial numbers on each boxcar and, after the train had passed, recite the numbers faultlessly.

The purpose of history, as I see it, is to uncover the forces which move the pawns on the chess board of the world. This and only this is real history and anything else, in the final analysis, is of no intrinsic value. In fact, it is actually negative in that it gives only specious reasons and motives for great events and thus can only confuse one who truly wants to know what happened and why.

For example, it is infinitely more important to know what forces backed Wendell Willkie against Robert Taft for the Republican nomination to run against Roosevelt in 1940 and to understand why they did so than it is to know how many votes there were for either on the first ballot or how many ballots there were.

You have often heard that Willkie or other candidates have been favored by the "Eastern Establishment." This is a cliche often used to describe a liberal, internationalist group based somewhere in the East which apparently derives its liberalism and internationalism from the brisk, salt air of the Atlantic Ocean. Not so. What is the "Eastern Establishment"? I will tell you precisely what it is. It is the big international banks of Wall Street and the power aggregation we refer to today as the Council on Foreign Relations, or the Trilateral Commission.

The banks were determined to defeat Taft in 1940 because they feared that if Taft was elected he would keep us out of the European war then in progress. At all costs, the mattoid bankers were determined to widen this war into a world war, and to push the people of America, however unwillingly, into it. With Willkie running against Roosevelt they couldn't lose. Both candidates favored our intervention into that insane bloodbath and the victory of the Soviet Union over Germany.

In 1952 Taft had again to be defeated to avoid the possibility that as president he would permit the America people to turn their backs on the bankers' plans to take America into a world economic system. The bankers backed and nominated Eisenhower who, of course, went on to the White House and the mattoids continued their policy-making for the American people.

This brings up the most pregnant political and historical question I know, and one which cries out for public discussion. It is one of those super-sensitive questions which almost nobody wants to talk about and yet which dominates the policy of the western world. Why do the banks and the super-rich—presumably the most capitalist of the capitalists—back the communists and the liberals and the internationalists? There is a political alliance here between the big international banks and the politi-

cal international left. This political alliance needs to be probed, analyzed and understood, not ignored.

The capitalist-communist political alliance is not the only one we must deal with if we attempt to write real history. I often recall a letter I once received from a gentleman who berated me thusly: "On the one hand," he said, "you say that the Zionists are in control of the administration. On the other, you say it is the Trilateralists. You are confused. I can't believe anything I read in your paper. Cancel my subscription immediately."

The man's complaint, I am sorry to say, mirrors a frame of mind all too common in our country. As my greatly-admired friend, the late Lawrence Dennis, used to say, Americans are monodiabolists. They believe in one devil at a time. They can't comprehend that there may be more than one devil. They are politically immature.

The fact is that all great historical events in a so-called "democracy" are produced by an alliance. Alliances are the very warp and woof of politics. There is no one pressure group strong enough to dominate all of the others. If you wish to know why we entered World War II or for that matter World War I look for an alliance of devils, not for one devil. If you wish to know why Willkie was nominated in 1940 and Eisenhower in 1952 or why the Senate ratified the Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union in 1963 or gave away the Panama Canal in 1978 or why the Congress consistently votes foreign aid or forced racial busing or why any number of things happen in America even though the voters may overwhelmingly oppose it, you must look for an alliance of pressure groups.

The place of the banks in historical events in the twentieth century and even before is difficult to overemphasize. Representatives of the banking system infest and dominate virtually every position of power with which their private interests are concerned. To fully comprehend this fact one needs an appreciation of the true dynamics of capitalist banking, including interest and inflation. One must try to understand how an economic/political/money system based on fractional reserve banking, compound interest and usury works and what crimes it must commit to survive.

The subject of money per se is separate and distinct from the subjects of politics and economics although each of the three bear an intimate symbiotic relationship with each other. Neither is comprehensible without the other two. One cannot discuss one or two of these subjects intelligently without also discussing the others. There can be no history worthy of the name that does not take all three into account. If politics is activity in relation to power, so is money manipulation and manipulation of the economy.

Now in the past few years there has been a healthy outpouring of revisionist books purporting to account for our present situation. Some authors have vented their monodiabolism on the bankers, describing in great detail the aid and assistance given to the communists by the supercapitalists. Others have written on the Zionists and Jewish influence, even to the point of virtually ignoring the non-Jewish capitalists. Many reduce all of our troubles to a political party based in Moscow. Still others have exposed something called the Illuminati, presumably a secret fraternity of mattoids bent on reducing the world to their dominion. Yet others have written lengthy books exposing the Masons as the culprits and, in what would appear to be a form of counteraction, the Jesuits.

Although confusing, all of these approaches are revisionist in spirit in that they seek to get behind the smokescreen of propaganda and explain the real events but they are all deficient in that they are all monodiabolistic: they fail to take into account other devils. For example, those who expose the capitalists either ignore those who write on Zionism or hurl the feared "anti-Semitic" epithet at them, no doubt believing that this clever ploy will induce the Zionists to join with them against the supercapitalists and communists. And those who write on the money issue seek also to avoid the Zionist issue because of fear. Historians and researchers like these ignore the reality of the political alliance between Zionism, communism and supercapitalism. Their monodiabolistic theories, in other words, are ripped apart by the hard rocks of political reality.

On the other hand, many writers on Zionism pooh-pooh the efforts of all who fail to join them in this bold and dangerous undertaking—even to the point, sometimes, of trying to prove that all supercapitalists are Jews.

All this is unnecessary and retards the cause of historical revisionism. We who believe that bringing history into accord with the facts is one of the most important tasks anyone can undertake must be tolerant with our fellow monodiabolists even though our particular devil may not be recognized by all others.

One of Winston Churchill's memorable phrases is that the Kremlin is a mystery wrapped in a riddle inside an enigma. Mr. Churchill's own career offers some of these qualities. Many of his early writings reflect an understanding of world affairs belied by his later actions when he decided to enter into the spirit of the age with gusto. Here is an excerpt from a lecture he gave at Oxford in 1930:

> Beyond our immediate difficulty lies the root problem of modern world economics; namely, the strange discordance between the consuming and producing power . . .

> If the doctrines of the old economists no longer serve for the purposes of our society, they must be replaced by a new body of doctrine equally well-related in itself, and equally well-fitting into a general plan . . .
>
> Have all our triumphs of research and organization bequeathed us only a new punishment—the Curse of Plenty? Are we really to believe that no better adjustment can be made between supply and demand? Yet the fact remains that every attempt has so far failed.
>
> Many various attempts have been made, from the extremes of Communism in Russia to the extremes of Capitalism in the United States. But all have failed, and we have advanced little further in this quest than in barbaric times.
>
> Surely it is this mysterious crack and fissure at the basis of all our arrangements and apparatus upon which the keenest minds throughout the world should be concentrated. (*Romanes Lectures at Oxford University*, 1930.)

To again refer to Lawrence Dennis, he too perceived—as any unbiased observer must—that there is no self-regulating balance between production and consumption but, on the contrary, production has, for the past fifty years or so, been outstripping the ability of our society to absorb it, and this trend grows at an accelerating rate. The reasons are basically two: the continuing advancement in production techniques of everything in the material world, and the constricting effect of a money system based on usury, compound interest and inflation—a money system which is designed not for the distribution of goods but for the profit of those who manipulate it. Thus, the balance between production and consumption must be redressed every generation or so by war, which not only consumes vast amounts of production but also removes men from the labor market and leaves a void of destruction as its aftermath which requires more production to repair. This describes the horror of our situation, all the more horrifying because so few have the courage to recognize it, be they liberal, Marxist, conservative, libertarian or some variety of religious specimen. As Lawrence Dennis said so often, "There is not a peace cloud in the war boom sky."

The big picture is this. We are all ensnared by the tentacles of a system of social control, operating at all levels of society, which demands the blood sacrifice of millions of the cream of our youth every generation in bloody aggression to maintain prosperity. The primary intellectual and, if you will, spiritual fundaments of this system spring from what passes for history, and are percolated down to the lowest member of society via a beautifully-coordinated machine which leaves nothing unsullied by its poisonous output. This Establishment false history not only omits and distorts facts which expose its own wickedness, greed and corruption—it invents other facts to prove its righteousness. This

thing is all-pervasive and can only be successfully combatted by challenging it all levels it is to be found. It is not merely a political problem, it has monetary and economic and social dimensions as well.

We may hope that some qualified and intrepid souls, endowed with sufficient funds to do the job, will come along and have the temerity to chronicle all, not just one, of the pressure groups which are driving this country and the western world to imminent suicide. When that historian appears, or those historians, the Institute for Historical Review will be ready.

The cassette tape recording of Mr. Carto's conference lecture is available from the IHR at $8.95. This tape also includes a lecture by Dr. Martin A. Larson entitled "A Brief History of Monetary Crimes Against America."

The Diesel Gas Chambers: Myth Within A Myth

FRIEDRICH PAUL BERG

(Paper presented to the 1983 International Revisionist Conference)

In any trial of even the most ordinary murder, one can expect an abundance of information about the murder weapon, including a detailed description of the weapon and how it was used. Surely, with regard to murder as novel and as bestially spectacular as the alleged mass-murder of millions of Jews in gas chambers, one would be given far more information. Surely, the postwar trials involving those monstrously amazing gas chambers would provide the most extensive and precise documentation possible regarding such unconventional murder weapons. But no, that is not what one finds at all. Although there is a vast literature, based in part on those trials, including many "eyewitness accounts" and "documentaries" covering the most diverse aspects of the holocaust story, nonetheless, as far as the actual mechanics of the extermination process are concerned, about all one ever finds is an occasional short and vague description.

The information gaps regarding the mechanics of the alleged extermination process should arouse the gravest suspicions. We are after all no longer in the immediate postwar era, when there would have been many valid excuses for confusion as to events which may or may not have taken place in a terrible war which had ended just recently. Almost forty years have now elapsed. The holocaust specialists have had more than enough time and opportunity to examine documents and alleged mass-murder sites

as well as the testimony from the most massive trials in the entire history of the world. Throughout this period they have certainly been active, and yet they have found little. Aside from a few bits and pieces of so-called "confessions" and "eyewitness testimony," they have, in fact, found next to nothing.

The information gaps are bad enough; what is far worse is that the bits and pieces of information which one *does* find are simply incredible. To kill people with gas is not inherently incredible since it certainly does happen, even accidentally. But if one carefully examines the available information about the German gas chambers from a scientific, medical or technical perspective, he soon realizes that he is dealing with an absurd muddle. To characterize the alleged mass-murder methodology as "harebrained," "crackpot," or simply "weird" is to understate the situation. The more one examines what little information there is, the more obvious it becomes that the people who repeat the holocaust story in one form or other really have no idea as to what they are talking or writing about. The testimony of the so-called eyewitnesses is especially weird. The Gerstein statement, which has been widely accepted by the holocaust specialists, is probably the best example of such testimony. But the other "statements" or "confessions" are almost as bad or worse.

The absurdity of the various alleged extermination methods does not in itself prove that the holocaust did not happen, but it should at least persuade reasonable people to ask for some other evidence before they let themselves believe such a monstrous tale. The fact that other evidence such as documents ordering the killing of Jews with gas, or hard, physical evidence such as workable gas chambers—not just ordinary rooms that have been mislabled—is also absent should make it quite obvious that something is seriously wrong. [1]

To concoct horrible, but conveniently vague, eyewitness accounts of mass-murder is easy. To have such tales accepted about a defeated enemy nation after a brutal war during which the vast media resources of the victors had succeeded in portraying the enemy as thoroughly depraved and wicked is also easy. On the other hand, it is not at all easy to explain how one could possibly commit mass-murder with Diesel exhaust.

The Exterminationist Position

Table 1 is from *The Destruction of the European Jews* by Raul Hilberg, published in 1961. The table summarizes the views of practically all the generally accepted, "consensus," writers on the holocaust story of the last 20 years. The camps listed are the only ones which Hilberg regarded as having been "extermina-

Characteristics of the Death Camps

Camp	Location	Jurisdiction	Type of Killing Operation	Number of Jews Killed
Kulmhof	Warthe-land	Higher SS and Police Leader (Koppe)	gas vans (CO)	over a hundred thousand
Belzec	Lublin district	SS and Police Leader (Globocnik)	gas chambers (CO)	hundreds of thousands
Sobibor	Lublin district	SS and Police Leader (Globocnik)	gas chambers (CO)	hundreds of thousands
Lublin	Lublin district	WVHA	gas chamber (CO), shooting	tens of thousands
Treblinka	Warsaw district	SS and Police Leader	gas chambers (CO)	hundreds of thousands
Auschwitz	Upper Silesia	WVHA	gas chambers (HCN)	one million

Table 1: Characteristics of the death camps according to Raul Hilberg. [2]

tion" camps. Camps such as Dachau, Bergen-Belsen, and Buchenwald are not included. [3]

The fourth column from the left shows that in all of the camps except for Auschwitz, the killing operation supposedly used carbon monoxide or CO. In Auschwitz the killing operation supposedly used hydrogen cyanide or HCN. Of the five camps where carbon monoxide was supposedly used, the vast majority of victims were supposedly killed in just three camps, namely: Treblinka, Belzec, and Sobibor. It is in those three camps that the carbon monoxide was supposedly generated by Diesel engines. The numbers of Jews who were supposedly killed in Kulmhof (Chelmno) or Lublin (Majdanek) are relatively small compared to the numbers for Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor.

On the basis of the generally accepted numbers of victims, one can say that *approximately half of all the Jewish victims of German gas chambers were supposedly gassed with Diesel exhaust.* In other words, the Diesel gas chambers are as important, at least in terms of the numbers of alleged victims, as the gas chambers that supposedly used Zyklon B and hydrogen cyanide.

For at least several months in 1939 and 1940, Diesel engines had supposedly been used as part of the euthanasia program to

kill Germans who were feebleminded or incurably ill in Germany. The experience gained from the use of Diesels for euthanasia was supposedly applied later by some of the same people involved with the euthanasia program, such as Reichsamtsleiter Viktor Brack and Kriminalkommisar Christian Wirth, to the killing of Jews in Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor in Eastern Poland. According to Hilberg, it was Wirth who supposedly constructed the "carbon monoxide gas chambers" for the euthanasia program on the orders of Brack, who was "actually in charge of the [euthanasia] operation." Then in the spring of 1942 Brack ordered Wirth to Lublin where "Wirth and his crew immediately and under primitive conditions began to construct chambers into which they piped carbon monoxide from *diesel* motors." (Emphasis added.)[4]

In the National Broadcasting Corporation's "Holocaust" miniseries for television, which was essentially a dramatization of the generally accepted holocaust story, there were several references to the use of Diesel engines for mass-murder. In one scene, Dr. Bruno Tesch, who in real life had been a highly qualified chemist and was hanged after the war by the Allies,[5] explains to Eric Dorf, a fictional SS officer administering the extermination program, that one of the advantages of Zyklon B over carbon monoxide is that Zyklon B "won't clog machinery—and there's no apparatus to break down, as in carbon monoxide." In another scene Rudolf Hoess, the commandant of Auschwitz, is about to start a Diesel when Eric Dorf explains to him that he will not need the Diesel anymore because he has ordered another substance, namely Zyklon B.

The Gerstein Statement

The statement of Kurt Gerstein is still a major cornerstone of the holocaust legend in general. Gerstein was an Obersturmfuehrer (First Lieutenant) in the SS and a mine surveyor by profession with a graduate degree in engineering. When he surrendered to the Americans, he supposedly gave them a prepared statement dated April 26, 1945 (in French, oddly enough) written partially on the backs of several receipts for the delivery of Zyklon B to Auschwitz. Since then he has been elevated to the status of "righteous gentile" by the Israelis and by various Jewish writers for having at least tried to alert the world regarding the Nazi extermination program.

The text which follows is a portion of the Gerstein statement as given in the English translation of *Harvest of Hate* by Leon Poliakov. Aside from a rather brazen "error" on the part of Poliakov, namely the claim that 700 to 800 bodies were crowded

into 93 square meters instead of only 25 square meters (which is the way the original documents actually read) it is probably no worse a translation than any of the other versions which can be found.[6]

> SS men pushed the men into the chambers. "Fill it up," Wirth ordered; 700-800 people in 93 [sic] square meters. The doors closed. Then I understood the reason for the "Heckenholt" sign. Heckenholt was the driver of the Diesel, whose exhaust was to kill these poor unfortunates. SS Unterscharfuehrer Heckenholt tried to start the motor. It wouldn't start! Captain Wirth came up. You could see he was afraid because I was there to see the disaster. Yes, I saw everything and waited. My stopwatch clocked it all: 50 minutes, 70 minutes, and the Diesel still would not start! The men were waiting in the gas chambers. You could hear them weeping "as though in a synagogue," said Professor Pfannenstiel, his eyes glued to the window in the wooden door. Captain Wirth, furious, struck with his whip the Ukrainian who helped Heckenholt. The Diesel started up after 2 hours and 49 minutes, by my stopwatch. Twenty-five minutes passed. You could see through the window that many were already dead, for an electric light illuminated the interior of the room. All were dead after thirty-two minutes! Jewish workers on the other side opened the wooden doors. They had been promised their lives in return for doing this horrible work, plus a small percentage of the money and valuables collected. The men were still standing, like columns of stone, with no room to fall or lean. Even in death you could tell the families, all holding hands. It was difficult to separate them while emptying the room for the next batch. The bodies were tossed out, blue, wet with sweat and urine, the legs smeared with excrement and menstrual blood.[7]

It was not a peephole through which Prof. Pfannenstiel supposedly looked into the gas chamber—it was a window. And it was a window in a wooden door—not a steel, gas-tight door as one might expect. Apparently, there were wooden doors on two sides of at least one of the gas chambers. We are told that the intended victims were still alive after almost three hours in the gas chambers before the Diesel even started. Surely, there must have been many air leaks into the chambers or else the Jews would have been asphyxiated without the aid of any Diesel.

The men were "standing, like columns of stone with no room to fall or lean. Even in death you could tell the *families, all holding hands.*" There is no mention anywhere of the intended victims trying to break out. Surely Prof. Pfannenstiel, with "his eyes glued to the window," would have noticed if some of the people on the other side had been trying to smash through.[8] But no, there is no mention of anything of the sort. We are, however, told that the victims had enough presence of mind to form groups of family members and hold hands.

According to the last sentence of the text quoted, "the bodies were tossed out blue, wet with sweat and urine." Here we have a flaw as far as the death-from-carbon-monoxide theory is concerned because victims of carbon monoxide poisoning are not blue at all. On the contrary, victims of carbon monoxide poisoning are a distinctive "cherry red," or "pink."[9] This is clearly stated in most toxicology handbooks and is probably well known to every doctor and to most, if not all, emergency medical personnel. Carbon monoxide poisoning is actually very common because of the automobile and accounts for more incidents of poison gas injury than all other gases combined.

The Gerstein statement, to its credit, makes no claim that carbon monoxide was the lethal ingredient in the Diesel exhaust. It is the exterminationists, i.e., the people who try to uphold the holocaust story, who have repeatedly stated that death was due to the carbon monoxide in the Diesel exhaust. The recurrence of references to "bluish" corpses in several examples of so-called "eyewitness testimony" from West German trials merely demonstrates the "copy-cat" nature of much of that testimony. That such testimony has been accepted by West German courts specializing in holocaust-related cases and by the holocaust scholars, apparently without any serious challenge, merely demonstrates the pathetic shoddiness of those trials and of the "scholarship" pertaining to the subject in general.

If the corpses had, indeed, appeared "bluish," death certainly would not have been due to carbon monoxide. A "bluish" appearance could have been an indication of death from asphyxiation, i.e., lack of oxygen. In this article we will investigate that possibility and we will see that in any Diesel gas chamber, although death from lack of oxygen is very unlikely, it is nonetheless far more likely than death from carbon monoxide.

According to Leon Poliakov, who is a French-Jewish historian and one of the few historians anywhere who has actually written at any length in support of the holocaust story, "there is little to add to this description [the Gerstein statement] which holds good for Treblinka, Sobibor as well as for the Belzec camp. The latter installations were constructed in almost the same way and also used the exhaust carbon monoxide gases from Diesel motors as death agents." According to Poliakov, more than a million and a half people were killed with Diesel exhaust.[10]

Toxic Effects of Carbon Monoxide

To investigate the Diesel gas chamber claim, two questions one should ask are: How much carbon monoxide is actually needed to kill a human being in half an hour? Does Diesel exhaust ever contain that much carbon monoxide?

Parts of carbon monoxide per million parts of air	Carbon monoxide in per cent	Physiological effects
100	(0.01%)	Concentration allowable for an exposure of several hours.
400 to 500	(.04%-.05%)	Concentration which can be inhaled for 1 hour without appreciable effect.
600 to 700	(.06%-.07%)	Concentration causing a just appreciable effect after exposure of 1 hour.
1,000 to 1,200	(.10%-.12%)	Concentration causing unpleasant but not dangerous effects after exposure of 1 hour.
1,500 to 2,000	(.15%-.2%)	Dangerous concentrations for exposure of 1 hour.
4,000 and above	(.4% and above)	Concentrations which are fatal in exposure of less than 1 hour.

Table 2: Toxic effects of carbon monoxide. [11]

Carbon monoxide poisoning has been thoroughly studied since about 1920, when it was carefully examined in order to determine the ventilation requirements of tunnels for motor vehicles, particularly for the New York City metropolitan area in such tunnels as the Holland Tunnel. Since the early 1940s, it has been widely accepted on the basis of the research of Yandell Henderson and J.S. Haldane that an average carbon monoxide concentration of "0.4% and above," as shown on the last line of Table 2, is the amount needed to kill people in "less" than one hour of continuous exposure.[12] Concentrations of 0.15% to 0.20% are considered "dangerous," which means they might kill some people in one hour, especially if those people have, for example, weak hearts. But in order to commit mass-murder in a gas chamber, one would require a concentration of poison gas sufficient to kill not merely a "portion" of any given group of people, but rather, sufficient to kill "all."

The vagueness introduced by Henderson's use of the term "less" is unfortunate. It arises from the fact that although Henderson and others were able to test for non-lethal effects in a laboratory with a high degree of accuracy, the lethal effects could not be tested in the same way. The lethal effects and the corresponding CO levels were determined on the basis of careful extrapolation of carboxyhemoglobin levels over time from non-lethal tests on humans and from some lethal tests on animals. Although the test results for lethal effects are not as precise as one might wish, they are nonetheless sufficiently accurate to support some important conclusions about Diesel gas chambers.

According to the exterminationists, the nasty deed was always done in less than half an hour. In order to determine how much carbon monoxide would be needed to kill in only half an hour, instead of a full hour, one can use the widely accepted rule of thumb known as "Henderson's Rule," which is:

% CO x (exposure time) = Constant for any given toxic effect.

In other words, for any given toxic effect, the poisonous concentration must be inversely proportional to the time of exposure. This means that to kill in half an hour, one would need twice the concentration that one would need to kill in a full hour. Applying this rule to the "0.4% and above" needed to kill in "less than one hour," we get 0.8% and above as the concentration needed to kill in less than half an hour. [13]

Applying the same rule to the 0.15% to 0.20% which is "dangerous" for one hour of exposure, we get 0.3% to 0.4% as the amount of CO which is dangerous for half an hour of exposure.

What all this means is that to have any kind of practical gas chamber using carbon monoxide as the lethal agent, one would need an average concentration of at least 0.4% carbon monoxide, but probably closer to 0.8%. We should keep "0.4% to 0.8%" in mind as benchmark numbers to which we can refer shortly.

The important consideration is always the "average" concentration over the entire exposure period and not some quantity of poison measured in pounds or cubic feet. To try to analyze the problem by determining actual quantities of CO produced, rather than "concentrations," would be futile since the little that one is told, in the case of Gerstein's description, about the actual size of the chamber or chambers is so incredible to begin with.

Figure 1 gives the symptoms of various low level carbon monoxide exposures as a function of time of exposure. The highest CO concentration which is discussed is 600 ppm (parts per million). 600 ppm is another way of saying 0.06%. The chart shows that after one hour of exposure to an average concentration of 600 ppm of CO, one would experience a headache but not a throbbing headache. Even after 100 hours of exposure, the worst that one would experience would be a coma but not death. However, after only half an hour of exposure to 600 ppm, no symptoms are indicated at all—not even a mild headache. We should keep "0.06%" in mind as another benchmark number to which we will refer.

The Diesel Engine

It would have been helpful if the holocaust proponents had provided such data as the engine manufacturer's name or the



Figure 1: Toxic effects of low levels of carbon monoxide. [14]

model number, size and HP rating of the engines. Although similar information would be considered essential in the investigation of any ordinary murder, alas, when one is dealing with holocaust such details are too much to expect. The most frequent claim seems to have been that the engines were Diesels from Soviet tanks (most Soviet tanks during the war were Diesel-driven, including the famous T-34), but it has recently been claimed that at least one of the engines was from a Soviet submarine. Any submarine engine would certainly have been a Diesel also.[15] In lieu of better information, one has to investigate the broader and more difficult question of whether or not any Diesel ever built could possibly have done the abominable deed.

If Gerstein had claimed that the carbon monoxide was generated by gasoline engines, his story might be more credible. Gasoline engines can, indeed, kill rather easily and with little or no warning because their exhaust is almost odorless. Although Diesel engines look very much like gasoline engines, at least to most people, they are actually quite different. Any mining engineer or mine surveyor should certainly have been able to easily distinguish between the two types of engines. For one thing, the sound of Diesels is so distinct that almost anyone can with a little experience recognize them with his eyes closed.

Another peculiarity of Diesels is that when in operation they usually give warning of their presence—their exhaust generally smells terrible. The intensity of the smell or stench has, no doubt, given rise to the thoroughly false impression that Diesel exhaust must therefore be very harmful.

Although Diesel exhaust is not totally harmless it is, in fact, one of the least harmful pollutants anywhere except for some possible long term, carcinogenic effects which are totally irrelevant for the operation of a gas chamber to commit mass-murder. Diesel emission levels have always been within the current air emission standards of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency without requiring any modifications or accessories. Diesels have always produced less than 1% carbon monoxide which is the current standard for internal combustion engines. Gasoline engines have only met the same standard after many years of research and after the addition of many complex accessories and engine modifications. The Diesels of the 1930s and 1940s were as clean-burning as, if not more clean than, Diesels of today.



Figure 2: Comparison of carbon monoxide emissions from Diesel and gasoline engines. [16]

Figure 2 compares the carbon monoxide emissions from Diesel and gasoline engines. Gasoline engines are sometimes called spark ignition engines as in this figure. Clearly, the logical choice between the two types of engines as a source of carbon monoxide would always have been the gasoline engine. From spark ignition or gasoline engines, one can easily get 7% carbon monoxide, but from Diesel engines one can never get even as much as 1% with liquid fuels.

Carbon monoxide emissions from internal combustion engines are commonly plotted as functions of air/fuel ratio or fuel/air

ratio. Fuel/air ratio is merely the reciprocal of air/fuel ratio. It has generally been accepted by the auto industry and by environmentalists that Diesel exhaust-gas composition is related chiefly to these ratios and not to other factors such as rpm.[17]

An air/fuel ratio of 100, for example, means that for every pound of fuel burned, 100 pounds of air are drawn into the engine. However, only about 15 pounds of air can ever react in any way chemically with each pound of fuel regardless of the air/fuel ratio or even the type of engine. This means that at an air/fuel ratio of 100, there are always about 85 pounds of air which do not react. These 85 pounds of excess air are blown out of the engine without undergoing any chemical change at all. As far as the excess air is concerned, the Diesel engine is nothing more than an unusual kind of blower or compressor.

Gasoline engines always operate with a deficiency of air. As a result of this deficiency, the reaction process in a gasoline engine can never go to completion; a relatively large proportion of carbon monoxide to carbon dioxide is always formed.

Diesels always operate with an excess of air. At idle, Diesels operate with air/fuel ratios as high as 200:1. At full load, the air/fuel ratio is only down to 18:1. Because of the abundance of air, there is always far greater opportunity for the fuel to burn to completion, thereby causing very little carbon monoxide to be produced as compared with gasoline engines. Also, what little carbon monoxide is produced in the cylinders of a Diesel is subsequently diluted by the excess air.

As soon as one acquires an understanding of the differences between Diesel and gasoline engines, it becomes obvious that the logical choice as a source of carbon monoxide would always have been the gasoline engine. The Diesel engine is, and always was, an inherently ludicrous choice as a source of carbon monoxide.

There are basically two types of Diesel engines: divided combustion chamber engines and undivided combustion chamber engines.

Divided Chamber Diesels

The divided chamber category of Diesel engines is generally subdivided into precombustion chamber designs and turbulent cell designs.

Figure 3 shows a pair of emission curves for Diesels with divided combustion chambers that were the result of exceptionally careful and extensive tests made in the early 1940s in the United States by the U.S. Bureau of Mines to determine whether or not Diesel engines could operate in underground mines without endangering miners.[19] The conclusion of the U.S. Bureau of



Figure 3: Carbon monoxide emissions for pre-combustion chamber and turbulent cell Diesel engines.[18] The heavy vertical line at a fuel:air ratio of 0.055 has been added by the author.

Mines as stated in many reports throughout the intervening years has always been that Diesels may operate underground in non-coal mines subject to USBM approval of the engines and the mechanical arrangements in which the engines are employed.

The lower curve in Figure 3 is for a pre-combustion chamber Diesel. The upper curve is for a turbulent cell Diesel. The lowest fuel/air ratio always corresponds approximately to idle and also to a no-load condition. For the pre-combustion chamber Diesel at idle, the carbon monoxide level is less than 0.02%. For the turbulent cell Diesel at idle, its carbon monoxide level is barely 0.06%. What this means is that at idle both of these types of Diesels could not produce enough carbon monoxide to even give a headache after half an hour of continuous exposure.

As one starts to impose loads on these engines, thereby, in effect, increasing the fuel/air ratios, the carbon monoxide levels

actually decrease at first. Only as one approaches full load, represented by the solid heavy line in the figure, do the carbon monoxide levels rise significantly to a maximum of 0.1% at a fuel/air ratio of .055. A CO concentration of 0.1% is still well below the benchmark range of numbers, "0.4% to 0.8%." In other words, neither of these engines could possibly have produced enough carbon monoxide to kill anyone in half an hour regardless of the loads on the engines.

Diesel Smoke

One characteristic of Diesels is that they tend to smoke. This is not due to any inherent inefficiency of Diesels. On the contrary, Diesels are as a rule extremely efficient. The smoke is primarily the result of the nature of Diesel combustion and the heavier fuels which are used—as compared with gasoline engines.

The solid heavy line in Figure 3 represents the smoke limit that manufacturers have found necessary to protect their engines from excessive wear due to smoke and solids accumulations within the cylinders. As a practical matter, a Diesel cannot be operated to the right of the solid heavy line with liquid fuels. In Figure 3 as well as in Figure 5, the solid heavy line is at a fuel/air ratio of 0.055. Many manufacturers are more conservative and limit their engines to fuel/air ratios below 0.050.

Diesel engines can operate safely at fuel/air ratios greater than 0.055 only if they are burning a clean gaseous fuel; this is the only way to avoid the buildup of solid material within the cylinders. The data shown for fuel/air ratios above 0.055 were only gathered because the researchers at the U.S. Bureau of Mines chose to test the engines for theoretical reasons with gaseous fuel far beyond the normal, full load settings of the respective engines.

The data for clean gaseous fuel is irrelevant to our analysis because if the Germans had had a gaseous fuel for the Diesel, they could have sent that gas directly to the gas chamber. To have used a Diesel engine as some kind of intermediate step would have made no sense at all. Such an arrangement could only have made the gas far less toxic. Since carbon monoxide is highly combustible, any carbon monoxide going into the Diesel would have been largely consumed within the engine.

Diesel smoke contains a liquid phase and a solid phase. The liquid phase generally gets blown out of the engine with the exhaust and, therefore, does no harm to the engine. But if enough solid material is also produced, and rapidly enough, some of that material will accumulate in the cylinders where in just a few minutes it can severely damage the piston rings and valves and



Figure 4: Liquid and solid components of Diesel smoke. [20]

cause the engine to simply self-destruct and stop. As the graph shows, the amount of solids produced by the engines increases dramatically just beyond a fuel/air ratio of 0.055. For this reason, manufacturers as a rule equip the fuel injection pumps with stops so that the engines can only operate below 0.055 or 0.050.

Operating any Diesel under any substantial load, regardless of the particular design or engine type, would have led to the production of significant amounts of smoke. Smoke is generally also noticeable immediately after start-up, even at idle or under light load, when the engine has not yet had time to reach its normal operating temperature. It should be no great surprise that there is no mention of any smoke from the Diesel—black, white, dense or otherwise—anywhere in the Gerstein statement or in any of the postwar trial testimony.



Figure 5: Carbon monoxide emissions from undivided chamber Diesel engines.[21] The heavy vertical line at a fuel:air ratio of 0.055 has been added by the author.

Undivided Chamber Diesels

Figure 5 shows that an undivided chamber Diesel still produces only about 0.03% carbon monoxide at idle, which is not enough to cause a headache after half an hour of exposure. However, as increasing loads are imposed on such an engine, the carbon monoxide levels do eventually rise rather sharply, and at full load, represented by the heavy vertical line, the carbon monoxide level is indeed about 0.4%. In other words, here we have a Diesel which looks as if it could have been used to commit mass-murder in half an hour.

The problem for this engine, and for all Diesels, is that to operate at full load continuously for long periods, such as half an hour at a time, would involve severe risks of fouling and damage from accumulated solids inside the cylinders. If operating at lower and safer fuel/air ratios than 0.055, which would also be

lower loads, the carbon monoxide emission levels drop very dramatically. For example, at 80% of full load, which is generally regarded as a safe maximum for continuous operation and which occurs at a fuel/air ratio of about .045, the carbon monoxide level is only 0.13%. According to Henderson's rule and index figures and some simple calculation, 0.13% carbon monoxide would not even be "dangerous" for half an hour of exposure.

That Figure 3 and Figure 5 are indeed typical of all Diesel engines over the last fifty years is attested to by the fact that these particular curves have been referred to and are still being referred to in countless journals and books on Diesel emissions to this very day. In other words, there are no better examples of Diesel emissions. To be sure, there are many other test results which one can find in reputable automotive journals such as the *Society of Automotive Engineers Transactions*. But if one takes the trouble to look through the *SAE Transactions* of the last forty years, as well as through other journals, he will not find any examples of worse carbon monoxide emissions than Figure 5. Our analysis of Figure 5 represents the worst case that can be found anywhere for any Diesel engine.

Engine Loading

Aside from the smoke problem, merely to impose a full load on any engine is far from easy. For example, if one has a truck, a full load can be imposed on the engine by first filling the truck with a heavy cargo and then racing the vehicle up a steep hill at maximum speed with the accelerator to the floor. Under that condition one would probably be putting out about 0.4% from the exhaust pipe if the truck's engine were an undivided chamber Diesel. However, if the truck is parked in a driveway, it is far more difficult to impose a full load on the engine. Simply "racing" the engine with the transmission in "neutral" will put no more than a few per cent of load on the engine. Letting the clutch slip and stepping on the accelerator may impose a somewhat greater load on the engine but the clutch will rapidly burn out. Jacking up the rear end of the vehicle and applying the brakes while racing the engine will impose a somewhat greater load but the brake linings will rapidly burn out.

The only way to realistically impose a significant load on any engine is by attaching to the engine some kind of brake dynamometer or other loading device, such as a generator with an electrical load.

Brake dynamometers could have been available and the Germans must have had many, but they are hardly the kind of equipment that one finds in the typical auto repair shop. They are

generally only available in well-equipped engineering testing laboratories. They cost much more than the engines to which they are attached, since they are not mass-produced.

A generator arrangement seems more plausible since places such as Treblinka and Belzec would have needed electricity, even if only to keep the barbed wire charged and the lights burning. However, such an arrangement suggests a continuous operation of both the generator and the Diesel which is contrary to the Gerstein statement. According to that statement, the engine was unable even to start for almost three hours prior to the actual gassing. There is nothing in the statement to even remotely suggest that the engine served any other purpose than to kill Jews. If it had had a dual purpose, for example, to also drive a generator, one could have expected some comment about the lights going on as the Diesel started—but there is nothing of the sort.

Aldehydes, Nitrous Oxides and Hydrocarbons

There are other pollutants in Diesel exhaust besides carbon monoxide. These are aldehydes, nitrous oxides, and hydrocarbons, which are indeed harmful. The smell or stench for which Diesels are notorious is not caused by carbon monoxide—carbon monoxide is completely odorless. The smell is caused by trace amounts of certain hydrocarbons and aldehydes which the most modern analytical instruments can just barely identify, let alone measure. The sensitivity of the human nose to these compounds is, however, extremely high and out of all proportion to the actual quantities present.

Nitrous oxides can form nitric acid by reacting with the moisture in the lungs which can, in turn, cause cancer after many months of exposure. One of the nitrous oxides formed by Diesels is tear gas, which is extremely irritating. The possible carcinogenic and mutagenic effects of nitrous oxides and certain other ingredients in Diesel exhaust may become the basis for special emission standards for Diesels in the not too distant future. All these effects are, however, long-term and totally irrelevant for mass-murder in a gas chamber.

Although Diesel exhaust is relatively harmless, inhaling it is not a pleasant experience. If Diesel exhaust were introduced into a large meeting room, it would not take very long before everyone present would feel driven by an overwhelming desire to get out, regardless of how safe he or she were convinced the exhaust really was. And yet, the Gerstein statement makes no mention of any attempt to break out of the gas chamber or even to break the "window." We are told rather that the victims formed family groups and held hands.

Oxygen in Diesel Exhaust

If the Jews were not murdered with carbon monoxide from Diesel exhaust, could they have died instead from the effects of reduced oxygen in Diesel exhaust? Such a theory would at least be consistent with the claim that the corpses were "blue." A bluish coloring to certain parts of a corpse is indeed a symptom of death from lack of oxygen. This theory, however, does not hold up very well because of the fact that Diesels always operate with excess air.



Figure 6: Exhaust gas constituents of internal combustion engines.[22] The heavy vertical line at a fuel:air ratio of 0.055 has been added by the author.

Normal air contains 21% oxygen. In Figure 6 we see that the oxygen concentration corresponding to idle in the exhaust of any

Diesel (divided or undivided chamber), shown near the top of the chart at a fuel/air ratio of 0.01, is 18%, which is just a few per cent less than one finds in normal air. At full load, which corresponds to a fuel/air ratio of 0.055, the oxygen concentration in the exhaust of any Diesel is 4%.

Probably the best discussion of the effects of reduced oxygen levels or asphyxia is provided by Henderson and Haggard:

> **Second Stage.** When the oxygen is diminished to values between 14 and 10 per cent the higher values of the brain are affected. Consciousness continues, but judgement becomes faulty. Severe injuries, such as burns, bruises and even broken bones, may cause no pain. Emotions, particularly ill temper and pugnacity, and less often hilarity, or an alteration of moods, are aroused with abnormal readiness. . . .
>
> **Third Stage.** When the oxygen is diminished to values between 10 and 6 per cent, nausea and vomiting may appear. The subject loses the ability to perform any vigorous muscular movements, or even to move at all. Bewilderment and loss of consciousness follow, either with fainting or a rigid, glassy-eyed coma. If revived, the subject may have no recollection of this state, or an entirely erroneous belief as to what has happened. Up to this stage, or even in it, he may be wholly unaware that anything is wrong. . . .
>
> **Fourth Stage.** When the oxygen is diminished below 6 per cent, respiration consists of gasps separated by apneas of increasing duration. Convulsive movements may occur. Then the breathing stops, but the heart may continue to beat for a few minutes and then develop ventricular fibrillation, or stand still in extreme dilation.[23]

According to Haldane and Priestley, "air containing less than 9.5 per cent of oxygen would ordinarily cause disablement within half an hour."[24] Disablement is still not death.

It is clear that there is no magic number below which death would occur, or above which life would continue. However, for any gas chamber relying upon reduced oxygen as the killing method, one would have to reduce the oxygen to below 9.5%—perhaps even below 6%.

From Figure 6 we see that to reduce the oxygen concentration in the exhaust to just 9%, any Diesel would have to operate at a fuel/air ratio of about 0.040, which corresponds to about ¾ of full load. To reduce the oxygen concentration to as low as 6%, which would be the fourth stage according to Henderson and Haggard and would almost certainly be the condition needed to kill "all" members of any intended group of victims, any Diesel would have to operate at a fuel/air ratio of about 0.048, which is close to full load. In other words, any Diesel gas chamber relying on the reduction of oxygen as a killing method would have to

operate at more than ¾ of full load, but probably closer to full load.

From the above it should be obvious that over most of their operating ranges, Diesels discharge sufficient oxygen so that one can literally inhale pure Diesel exhaust and survive on the oxygen in the exhaust. From idle to at least ¾ of full load, Diesel exhaust contains sufficient oxygen to sustain human life for at least half an hour.

Carbon Dioxide

If the Jews were not killed with carbon monoxide or from a lack of oxygen, could they have died instead from the effects of carbon dioxide?

Carbon dioxide is not really any more poisonous than ordinary water. Most toxicology handbooks do not even mention it. When mentioned at all, it is generally classified as a "non-toxic, simple asphyxiant." There are occasional accidental fatalities where carbon dioxide is directly involved. Death in almost all such cases is caused by a lack of oxygen. The lack of oxygen is caused by the fact that the carbon dioxide is much heavier than oxygen and will, especially in an enclosed space, displace oxygen in the same way that water will displace air in the lungs of a drowning man. The cause of death, chemically, in both situations is not carbon dioxide but rather the lack of oxygen in the blood. One symptom of this kind of death is a bluish appearance of the skin.

Carbon dioxide can be beneficial and therapeutic.[25] It is commonly used in clinical medicine as a harmless stimulant for respiration, for which purpose it is supplied under pressure in cylinders (Carbogen) containing oxygen and 7% carbon dioxide.[26] Normally, when a person exhales, the air leaving the lungs contains about 5.5% carbon dioxide.

Levels of 3% carbon dioxide are quite tolerable for exposures lasting several days. For example, in the 1950s the U.S. Navy experimented with gas mixtures containing 3% carbon dioxide and 15% oxygen, i.e., 25% less oxygen than in normal air, for use in American submarines with exposures lasting up to several weeks.[27]

For Diesel engines, the carbon dioxide level at or near idle is only about 2% and gradually increases to about 12% at full load as shown in Figure 6. A carbon dioxide level of 12% may cause cardiac irregularity and may, therefore, be dangerous for people with weak hearts. Gasoline engines, in contrast to Diesels, produce 12% already at idle. In general, if enough oxygen is available, a carbon dioxide level even as high as 12% is not likely to cause death. However, when the carbon dioxide level is this high

in Diesel exhaust, the corresponding oxygen level is dangerously low.

The principal danger to life from Diesel exhaust arises not from the abundance of carbon dioxide, nor even from carbon monoxide, but rather from the lack of oxygen.

Diesel Gas Chamber Operation

If the exhaust pipe from a Diesel engine is connected to a gas chamber, the carbon monoxide concentration will initially be extremely low and the oxygen level will initially be high. (Since the doors of a gas chamber must be opened to allow the intended victims to enter, fresh air must enter the chamber also.) As soon as the Diesel starts and as more and more Diesel exhaust is introduced into the chamber, the carbon monoxide concentration will gradually rise to the level directly inside the exhaust pipe of the Diesel engine without ever being able to exceed that level. Exactly how long it would take before the oxygen and carbon monoxide levels in the gas chamber equal the levels in the engine exhaust pipe is impossible to determine in the case of the Gerstein account because the information about the engine and gas chamber is so limited.

To get a better idea as to how effective—or ineffective—a Diesel gas chamber such as that described by Gerstein might have been in practice, we can analyze the problem by dividing the half-hour into two periods: a period of "rising CO concentration" followed by a period of "constant CO concentration." Since we do not know the size or rpm of the engine, or the size of the chamber, or the amount of leakage into or out of the chamber, we cannot possibly determine the actual duration of each of these two periods. Nonetheless, we do know that when they are added together, the sum must equal half an hour.

For the "constant period," the deadliest arrangement would use an undivided chamber Diesel which could give a carbon monoxide concentration as high as 0.4%.

For the "rising" period, the carbon monoxide concentration would be near zero initially and no more than 0.4% at the end. When we average these two numbers together, we get a maximum, average concentration for the "rising" period of 0.2% assuming a steady rise in carbon monoxide.

The combined average over the entire half-hour cannot be determined precisely because we simply do not know the duration of the "rising" and "constant" periods respectively. But we can be sure that it would always be some number less than 0.4%. If the "rising" period had only been of short duration, the combined average for half an hour would be only slightly less than

0.4%. If the "rising" period had been longer, the combined average would be lower.

If the "rising" and "constant" periods had each lasted for fifteen minutes, the combined average concentration for the entire half hour would be less than 0.3%. According to our previous analysis of toxic effects, 0.3% of CO (for half an hour) is only "dangerous" which means that it could have killed no more than a portion of any group of intended victims.

Without knowing the type and size of the engine, and the amount of leakage into the gas chamber, we cannot possibly determine the exact carbon monoxide concentration in the gas chamber. We do know, however, that the average would always be less than 0.4%. It would always be less than the benchmark number which was established previously as the minimum amount required in the Gerstein-Diesel gas chamber. In other words, the carbon monoxide from any Diesel ever built would by itself never have been able to kill more than a portion of any group of intended victims even if the Diesel were of the undivided chamber design and even if it were operated at full load.

A similar analysis of the effects of reduced oxygen would show that one would have had to operate any Diesel ever built at some indeterminate level above ¾ of full load before the arrangement could have been even marginally lethal due to lack of oxygen.

An analysis of the combined effects of carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide and reduced oxygen might be possible on the basis of the research of Haldane and Henderson, but it would not give any significantly different results than what has already been concluded on the basis of reduced oxygen acting alone. The reason is that the carbon monoxide and carbon dioxide levels are just too low to make much difference.

In any event, any Diesel ever built would have had to operate at a minimum of ¾ of full load in order for the Diesel gas chamber to have been even marginally effective from any possible combination of toxic effects.

Noise and Vibration

In addition to their smoke and smell, Diesel engines are also notorious for their intense noise and vibration. Because of their higher compression ratios, lower rpm's, and the type of combustion, the amount of vibration that Diesels produce is substantially greater than that of any comparably sized gasoline engines. The noise and vibration are among the major reasons why Diesels have not generally been used in automobiles.

If the 12 cylinder, V-type Diesel engine from a typical Soviet T-34 tank with a rated capacity of 500 HP had been mounted on

the floor of a small building and had been operated for half an hour at more than ¾ of full load, i.e., at more than 375 HP, the noise and vibration would have been at least as noteworthy and as wildly spectacular as the wailing of any Jews—and yet, there is no mention of any such noise or vibration in the Gerstein statement or in any of the postwar trial testimony.

Diesels for Mass-Murder?

Without some understanding of the basic characteristics of Diesel engines, the method that would have come to mind most readily for any would-be mass-murder would have been to simply mount a Diesel on the floor of a building and direct the exhaust into some adjoining rooms without any provision for artificial load on the engine. Such an arrangement would have annoyed the hell out of any group of intended victims, but would have given them nothing worse than a headache. The headache would have been due to the stench and smoke and noise but certainly not to carbon monoxide or lack of oxygen. As a method for committing mass-murder, it would have been a fiasco.

For any Diesel arrangement to have been even marginally effective for mass-murder would have required an exceptionally well-informed collection of individuals to know and do all that was necessary. They would have had to be familiar with the carbon monoxide and oxygen emission curves for their particular engine. Such information is probably not known even today by most engineers, despite all the popular concern over air pollution. The gas chamber designers would also have had to know how to impose and maintain an engine load of more than ¾ of full load on their engine since anything less would just not have been enough. If they had overloaded the engine or operated it for too long at or near full load (more than 80% of full load is generally considered unsafe for continous operation), they might after each gassing have had to overhaul and, perhaps, replace the engine because of fouling and damage from engine smoke. Merely to gather and properly assemble the appropriate equipment, including the equipment for imposing and controlling an artificial load, would have been a major undertaking which would have required the expertise of experienced engineers, not just ordinary auto mechanics. The mounting of the engine on the floor of the building would have required a proper foundation with some provision to isolate vibrations so as to avoid tearing the building apart.

The all-important question is: if any persons had been smart enough and resourceful enough to know and do all that was necessary to make a workable Diesel gas chamber, why would

they have bothered to try to use a Diesel engine in the first place? For all their efforts they would have had a gas chamber which at the very worst would still have been only marginally effective at its morbid task. For all their efforts they would have had an average concentration of less than 0.4% carbon monoxide and more than 4% oxygen. Any common, ordinary gasoline engine without any special attachments would easily have given them ten times as much carbon monoxide at idle as any comparably sized Diesel at full load. Any common, ordinary gasoline engine would easily have given them 7% carbon monoxide and less than 1% oxygen. If one had tampered with the carburetor, one could probably have had as much as 12% carbon monoxide by merely turning one small screw, namely the idle-mixture adjustment screw.

Comparing the two types of engines, with both operating at idle or under light load, the difference is even more dramatic. At idle or under light load any common, ordinary gasoline engine without any special attachments would easily have given more than one hundred times as much carbon monoxide as any comparably sized Diesel.

The Diesel gas chamber story is incredible on these grounds alone. However, the story becomes even more incredible when one discovers that far better sources of carbon monoxide, better even than gasoline engines, were readily available to the Germans. Those other sources did not require either Diesel fuel or gasoline.

The Gaswagons

During World War II all European countries relied for most of their non-military vehicular transport needs upon vehicles which burned neither gasoline nor oil, but burned solid fuels such as wood, charcoal, or coal instead. The solid fuel, which was generally wood, was first converted into a mixture of combustible gases by burning in a generator, usually mounted at the rear of the vehicle. The gases were then withdrawn from the generator and burned in a modified gasoline or Diesel engine located at the front of the vehicle. The combustible gas produced in this way always contained between 18% and 35% carbon monoxide.

In English-speaking countries, these vehicles were generally called "producer gas vehicles." However, they could just as appropriately have been called "poison gas vehicles" because that is precisely what they were—the gas which they produced was extremely poisonous. The operation of these vehicles required special safety procedures as well as special government-approved training and licensing of the *many thousands of drivers*

Figure 7: A typical gaswagon which had originally been a conventional bus but which was subsequently retro-fitted with a gas-generator and a Saurer engine. [28]

who drove these vehicles daily throughout most of the war in German-occupied Europe. [29]

In German-speaking parts of Europe, the producer gas vehicles were called "Gaswagen." If they burned wood, which most of them did, they were generally called "Holzgaswagen," which literally translated means "woodgaswagons." *The abundance of the gaswagons throughout German-occupied Europe and the intensity with which the Germans were developing ever newer vehicles and applications of the producer gas technology is a fact which undermines the holocaust story in general. Had the Germans ever intended to commit mass-murder with carbon monoxide, they certainly would have employed the producer gas technology long before they would have ever used anything as idiotic as Diesel exhaust.* Surely, Eichmann and the other "transportation experts" involved with the "final solution of the Jewish problem," which was to a great extent a transportation problem, would have been well aware of these vehicles and of their unique features. Surely, they would have used the "gaswagons" to kill the Jews had there ever been any intent to kill the Jews with poison gas.

The gaswagons are not the "gas vans" which were allegedly used for mass-murder in Chelmo, and by the Einsatzgruppen in Russia, despite the fact that the terminology is identical in Ger-

man. The murderous "gas vans" were, as can be seen in all of the "evidence" pertaining to the gas van story, conventional trucks which supposedly used "only" the exhaust of the engines as the killing agent. The basis of the "gas van" story is a strange document known as "PS-501" which is, in my opinion, a forgery based on an innocuous letter from SS Untersturmfuehrer (First Lieutenant) Becker to SS Obersturmbannfuehrer (Lieutenant Colonel) Walter Rauff, discussing some of the many problems that must have occurred with gaswagons.[30] The letter was apparently rewritten and the text partially changed so as to give it a sinister meaning. A thorough analysis of the gaswagons and PS-501 is, however, beyond the scope of this article.[31]

The gaswagons, which would have been far superior for mass-murder to any conventionally powered vehicles, including the "gas vans," traveled on all the roads of Europe and into and from the concentration camps daily. And yet, these potentially perfect mass-murder devices have never been implicated by the promoters of the holocaust story in even a single murder!

The gas van story is merely an adaptation by the holocaust propagandists of some documentary materials related to the perfectly innocent use of producer gas vehicles, supported of course by appropriate "eyewitness" testimony generated after the war. It is within the gas van story that one clearly sees in miniature the evolutionary process of the larger, general holocaust story.

Coal Gasification

In addition to the producer gas technology, the Germans had the world's most advanced coal gasification technology.[32] One of the first steps in most of the coal gasification processes was to produce carbon monoxide from coal. The carbon monoxide could then be used either as a fuel or as an intermediate step in the synthesis of other products.

Because of Germany's isolation from adequate sources of petroleum and natural rubber, she had converted much of her industry already during World War I to use coal as a substitute source of hydrocarbons for making synthetic liquid fuels as well as a vast assortment of chemical substances, including synthetic rubber. The quantities of carbon monoxide that were produced as part of this technology measured in the millions of tons and would have been more than enough to kill the entire population of Europe many times over.

Coal gasification plants were located in all of Germany's industrial areas. One region containing several such plants was Silesia, where the abundance of coal had for more than a century been the basis of that region's industry. One Silesian facility was the I.G. Farben plant at Auschwitz, a small portion of whose

carbon monoxide could easily have been diverted through a small pipeline to Auschwitz-Birkenau only a few miles away. Of course, no one alleges that carbon monoxide was ever used for mass-murder at Auschwitz although that would have been an ideal place for it. For mass-murder at Auschwitz, the Germans supposedly used a completely different substance, Zyklon B.

Conclusion

Although it would be most convenient for the revisionist camp in the holocaust controversy to be able to say that mass-murder could not possibly have been committed with Diesel exhaust in half an hour, that simply cannot be said with total accuracy. It must be conceded that it would have been remotely possible to commit the deeds in question with Diesels. However, it would certainly have required an inordinate amount of expertise and determination and, for all their efforts, the would-be murderers would have had an arrangement which at best (worst?) would still have been only marginally effective at its morbid task. From a practical perspective the whole idea of perfecting a Diesel arrangement for such a purpose would have been contrary to all common sense.

One is sometimes told in the Holocaust literature that the reason the Germans used gas chambers to murder the Jews was to avoid the emotional strain on soldiers who would have otherwise had to kill the Jews by shooting them by the thousands. It is suggested that the gas chamber method was more efficient somehow. No doubt, an efficient killing method could have been developed—but not with Diesel exhaust. From all the evidence we have seen regarding Diesel exhaust and its effects, a more hideously clumsy, and inefficient, method of committing mass-murder would be hard to imagine. Although it is conceivable that some deranged minds may have tried for a time to commit murder with Diesel exhaust, after a few tries it would have become apparent to even the most demented fiend that something better was needed. And yet, Christian Wirth supposedly asked Gerstein not to propose in Berlin any other kind of gas chamber. [3] Supposedly, it was not just a few people who were killed with Diesel exhaust, but millions. To have used such a clumsy method to kill Jews, especially when far better methods were readily available, is incredible enough, but that the same clumsy method would have also been used by the Germans on their own people as part of a euthanasia program is even more incredible.

Postscript: More Surprises to Come!

A marvelous metamorphosis is already taking place in the holocaust story. Several leading holocaust proponents are now taking great pains to *drop* the Diesel claim and replace it with the view that the engines were not Diesels but conventional gasoline engines which simply burned Diesel fuel, presumably to make the engines more deadly than if they had only burned regular gasoline. This amazing transformation has appeared in a recent book in Germany entitled *Nationalsozialistiche Massentoetungen durch Giftgas.*[34] The book was a joint project of 24 of the most eminent scholars on the subject, including such notables as Eugen Kogon, Hermann Langbein, Adalbert Rueckerl, Gideon Hausner, Germaine Tillion and Georges Wellers. The book represents the current state of the art of holocaust mythomania and has already been recommended by the World Jewish Congress in London.[35] The new, "revised" version of the holocaust says, in effect, that Gerstein and others were *mistaken* when they had claimed that Diesels were used to kill Jews at Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor. The claim now is that *gasoline* engines were used.

The clumsy juggling of evidence which characterizes this book is exemplified by the fact that although the Gerstein statement refers to Diesel engines four times, *the portion of the Gerstein statement which is quoted in this supposedly definitive rebuttal of the revisionists does not mention Diesels at all, nor does it even describe the alleged killing process.*[36] For a description of the killing process that Gerstein supposedly witnessed, the book gives a piece of postwar testimony by Dr. Pfannenstiel in which there is also no mention of the use of Diesels, but only of the use of Diesel fuel in the engine. How one could possibly have operated a gasoline engine with Diesel fuel is, of course, left to the imagination. The fact is that *any gasoline engine simply would not operate with Diesel fuel* (and vice-versa).

A fatal flaw in the new, non-Diesel, version is the retention of the recurrent claim that the corpses were "blue." Although any possible death from Diesel exhaust would have been due to lack of oxygen, which would in turn have caused a bluish appearance of the corpse, death from gasoline engine exhaust would "only" have been due to carbon monoxide and could "only" have caused a distinctive "cherry red" or "pink" appearance. Although Pfannenstiel's postwar testimony is generally less wild than the Gerstein statement, nonetheless he and other "eyewitnesses" also repeated the claim that the corpses were "blue."[37]

That the Gerstein statement, although in a severely abbreviated form, is included at all in such a scholarly work, despite the problems for the "revised" version of the holocaust story

which should be obvious to anyone looking at the complete text of that statement, only shows how desperate the holocaust scholars are to scrape together everything they have in support of their monstrous fantasy. They have precious little, and the Gerstein statement is still the best evidence they can present.

The new "revised" version of the holocaust story is actually more absurd than the old version. Although it might be remotely possible for an engineer to have mistaken a gasoline engine for a Diesel engine, how could anyone possibly have mistaken "red" for "blue"? Perhaps they were all color blind—we will just have to wait and see. No doubt, we will see many more attempts by desperate men to hold together a crumbling patchwork of lies.

The Diesel gas chamber claim is rubbish—apparently some of the exterminationists themselves recognize that now. However, the alternate claim that gasoline engine exhaust was used instead is rubbish also.

Notes

1. The "gaschambers" that one is shown today in Dachau, Auschwitz and elsewhere are practically nothing more than ordinary rooms which could not have been used to kill in the manner alleged. The Diesel gas chambers in Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor were all supposedly destroyed long before the end of the war.
2. Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews* (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961), p. 572.
3. It was at these camps that many photos were taken of dead bodies, many already in advanced states of decay. These photos are still being presented as proof of Jewish extermination. No comparable photos were taken in Auschwitz, for example. Already in 1960 Dr. Martin Broszat of the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich wrote in a letter to *Die Zeit* (19 August 1960), p. 16, stating that there had been "no gas chambers in the Altreich," meaning Germany within its pre-1937 borders, but rather "gassings took place only in German-occupied Poland." The exclusion of Dachau, Bergen-Belsen and Buchenwald from the current litany of extermination camps in the serious literature is a tacit admission that at least a "mini-hoax" had been perpetrated earlier.
4. Hilberg, pp. 561-62.
5. William B. Lindsey, "Zyklon B, Auschwitz, and the Trial of Dr. Bruno Tesch," *Journal of Historical Review* Vol. 4, No. 3 (Fall 1983).
6. In a trial in France in 1982 in which Dr. Robert Faurisson had been sued for slander by Poliakov for having described him as a "falsifier of history," Poliakov had explained that he had simply misread a poor quality copy of a copy, several times removed, of the original Gerstein document.

7. Leon Poliakov, *Harvest of Hate*, Holocaust Library (New York: Schocken Books, 1979), p. 195.
8. Dr. Wilhelm Pfannenstiel was a professor at the Institute for Hygiene at the University of Marburg an der Lahn. An article by him on the effectiveness of vitamin K was published in *Deutsche Zeitschrift fuer Chirurgie*, 257 Band (1943) pp. 639-42. Also, an answer by him to a reader's question was published by the *Muenchener Medizinische Wochenschrift* (4 July 1941), p. 766, with his home address: Pilgrimstein 2, Marburg an der Lahn. He was apparently sent to Belzec as well as other camps as a medical consultant to improve camp sanitation. After the war he was interrogated every few years with regard to his visit to Belzec with Gerstein and on two occasions was prosecuted, the last trial being in April 1970 in Marburg. Essentially, his testimony was always to support the Gerstein statement while at the same time avoiding or denying anything which would incriminate himself.
9. S. Kaye, *Handbook of Emergency Toxicology*, 4th ed. (Springfield: C.C. Thomas, 1980) pp. 187-88. For a more detailed discussion of toxic effects of CO see: C.J. Polson & R.N. Tattersall, *Clinical Toxicology* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1969), pp. 604-21.
10. Poliakov, p. 196.
11. Y. Henderson and H.W. Haggard, *Noxious Gases* (New York: Reinhold Publishing, 1943), p. 168.
12. W. Baker and A.L. Mossman, *Effects of Exposure to Toxic Gases*, (East Rutherford, New Jersey: Matheson Gas Products, 1970), p. 12.
13. F.E. Camps, *Medical and Scientific Investigations in the Christie Case* (London: Medical Publications Ltd., 1953), p. 170.
14. P.S. Myers, "Automobile Emissions—A Study in Environmental Benefits versus Technological Costs," *Society of Automotive Engineers Transactions* Vol. 79 (1970), Section 1, paper 700182, p. 662.
15. A Russian submarine engine is mentioned, without any details, in Jochen Von Lang, *Eichmann Interrogated* (New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1983) p. 76. Since World War I, gasoline engines have as a rule been excluded from submarines because of the toxicity of their exhaust and the flammability of their fuel. Thus, any submarine engine, even from a Soviet submarine, would have been a Diesel and would probably have been as powerful as the engine from any tank.
16. David F. Merrion, "Effect of Design Revisions on Two Stroke Cycle Diesel Engine Exhaust," *Society of Automotive Engineers Transactions* Vol. 77 (1968), paper 680422, p. 1535.
17. J.C. Holtz, "Safety with mobile diesel-powered equipment underground," *Report of Investigations No. 5616*, U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, Washington, 1960, p. 67.
18. Figure 3 and Figure 5 have been used repeatedly over the last forty years in the technical literature by numerous engineers thereby demonstrating the reliability of the data on which these figures are based and the extent to which they represent the worst possible carbon monoxide emission levels from all Diesels. Two of the early examples of articles using Figure 3 are: H.H. Schrenk and L.B. Berger, "Composition of Diesel Engine Exhaust Gas," *American*

Journal of Public Health Vol. 31, No. 7 (July 1941), p. 674, and Martin A. Elliott, "Combustion of Diesel Fuel," *Society of Automotive Engineers Quarterly Transactions* Vol. 3, No. 3 (July 1949), p. 509.

19. Although the related tests and their purpose have been discussed in many articles, probably the best is in Holtz.
20. Elliot and Davis, "Composition of Diesel Exhaust Gas," *SAE Quarterly Transactions* Vol. 4, No. 3 (July 1950), pp. 345-46—discussion by E.W. Landen.
21. Ibid, p. 333.
22. Edward F. Obert, *Internal Combustion Engines and Air Pollution* (New York and London: Intext Educational Publishers, 1973), p. 361.
23. Henderson & Haggard, pp. 144-45.
24. J.S. Haldane & J.G. Priestly, *Respiration* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935), pp. 223-24.
25. L.J. Meduna, *Carbon Dioxide Therapy* (Springfield: C.C. Thomas), pp. 3-19.
26. J.D.P. Graham, *The Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute Poisoning* (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 215-17.
27. L.T. Fairhall, *Industrial Toxicology*, 2nd ed. (Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1957), p. 180.
28. Wolfgang Oerley, "Entwicklung und Stand der Holzgaserzeuger in Oesterreich, Maerz 1938 [Development and Status of Woodgas Generators in Austria, March 1938]," in *ATZ Automobiltechnische Zeitschrift*, Heft 11 (April 1939), p. 314. Before the war, the leading company not only in Europe but probably in the entire world in the manufacture and development of "woodgaswagons" was the Vienna-based Saurer Company. This is the same company which is identified, oddly enough, as the manufacturer of the murderous "gas vans" in PS-501.
29. The German automotive technical literature of that period abounds with material on this forgotten subject. For an introductory survey of the subject, two especially useful issues of *ATZ* are Heft 18 from September 1940 and from 1941.
30. Rauff is now residing in Chile where he is pursued by the likes of Simon Wiesenthal and Beate Klarsfeld. A recent attempt by the ADL in the U.S.A. and by others to have him extradited to Israel was denied by the Chilean government because of Chile's statute of limitations and because of Rauff's faultless behavior in Chile.
31. A more thorough analysis of the gas wagons, and of Zyklon B, may be found in the author's taped presentation given in Los Angeles on 6 September 1983 before the International Revisionist Conference of the Institute for Historical Review, from which this article is essentially an abridgement. The audio cassette is available from the Institute.
32. An excellent discussion of the subject including extensive lists of references, especially German references, is: W. Gumz and J.F. Foster of the Battelle Memorial Inst., "A Critical Survey of Methods of Making a High BTU Gas from Coal," Research Bull. No. 6 (New York: American Gas Association, July 1953).

33. See the complete text of the Gerstein statement in Arthur R. Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* (Torrance, CA: Institute for Historical Review, 1982) p. 254. The extermination technology employed at Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor was supposedly no longer an experimental technology in 1942 but rather a highly developed technology based upon almost three years of practical experience beginning in 1939 with the euthanasia program.
34. *Nationalsozialistische Massentoetungen durch Giftgas* [National Socialist Mass-Murders with Poison Gas] (Frankfurt: S. Fischer Verlag, 1983).
35. *Chicago Jewish Sentinel* (22 December 1983).
36. *Nationalsozialistische Massentoetungen durch Giftgas*, p. 172-74.
37. See, for example, his testimony before the Darmstadt court from 6 June 1950 which appears in Saul Friedlaender, *Counterfeit Nazi: The Ambiguity of Good* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967), p. 118. For a thorough discussion of the kind of mad dilemma confronting any German who was even remotely connected with the concentration camps—Treblinka, Belzec and Sobibor were actually transit camps rather than concentration camps—see the article by W.B. Lindsey.

The 90-minute cassette tape recording of Mr. Berg's conference lecture is available from the IHR at $8.95.

'Der Auschwitz Mythos': A Book and Its Fate in the German Federal Republic

WILHELM STAEGLICH

From a Translation by Charles E. Weber

(Paper presented to the 1983 International Revisionist Conference)

To sin by silence when they should protest makes cowards of men. [retranslation]

—President Abraham Lincoln

I was not yet acquainted with these words of Lincoln when, after the Second World War, I repeatedly expressed doubts in conversations with a wide range of people about the alleged atrocities in German concentration camps. It simply appeared to me my obvious duty to report, in such conversations, what I had seen—or, for that matter, had not seen—in the Auschwitz region around the middle of the year 1944. At that time, in the so-called *Stammlager* [original or parent camp] of Auschwitz, I saw orderly quarters and sanitary facilities, and internees who were well nourished and who appeared to have neither special demoralization nor fear, let alone a fear of death. Moreover, I never noticed mistreatments of internees nor, in particular, any sign—such as clouds of smoke or the stench of burning corpses—of mass extermination of human beings.

At that time, as the *Ordonnanzoffizier* [warrant officer] on the staff of an antiaircraft detachment stationed near Auschwitz from mid-July to approximately mid-September 1944 for the protection of the industrial plants in the area of the concentration camp, it was my duty to maintain contact with the SS camp command. For that reason I had unlimited access to the Auschwitz *Stammlager*, where the camp command was located. I

should state that I never entered the Birkenau camp, which was located about two miles away.

In 1965 (when the famous first Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial was just being concluded) I was denounced as a "Nazi" by one of my judicial colleagues in Hamburg to the Jewish mayor of the city, as a result of my remarks concerning Auschwitz. That led to the initiation of a disciplinary proceeding against me. Its objective was to expel me from civil service. The notable feature of this proceeding, which lasted nearly two years, was the fact that the attempt was made to render me ineffective during its course with the aid of a psychiatrist (apparently of Jewish origin), this after it became obvious that the proceeding would probably not lead to the desired success, as a result of legal factors. I could only thank the energetic intercession of my defense attorney for the fact that nothing came of this scheme, which is otherwise known as characteristic only of the Communist sphere of influence. I was acquitted "for lack of evidence" because the exact contents of my remarks could not be determined, in the opinion of the disciplinary judge, who appeared to have a good opinion of me.

This disciplinary proceeding was for me the first incentive to analyze the Auschwitz problem in a somewhat more thorough manner. And so I began to study the official literature about it. The more I read, the more improbable indeed seemed to me the thesis of the "extermination camp of Auschwitz." More and more I recognized that the descriptions of it were different from the atrocity propaganda of the First World War only insofar as the details were concerned.

Around the middle of 1973 I acquired by chance the eyewitness report of Thies Christophersen, published as a booklet under the title *Die Auschwitz-Lüge*.[1] Christophersen, whom I did not then know, completely confirmed with his report the impressions which I myself had gained of Auschwitz in the year 1944. All the doubts (about my own doubts) which occasionally occurred to me were thus as if expunged, especially after I became acquainted personally with the author. My reaction was such because Christophersen had, after all, been a member of the command personnel of the ancillary camp of Rajsko for a whole year and had himself even picked out his labor internees from the ill-famed Birkenau camp. Naturally, he had thus obtained a much deeper insight into the conditions of the Auschwitz region than I.

I no longer saw any reason not to release for publication my own impressions of Auschwitz—which, even during the disciplinary proceeding, had been recorded in writing in the archive of the German monthly periodical *Nation Europa*. Their publication took place in the October 1973 issue under my full name and with the note that I was a judge fulfilling my duties in Hamburg. I

was quite cognizant of the risks involved in this, but I hoped that the ban placed for years on the critical discussion of "Auschwitz" had now been broken and that after Christophersen's courageous appearance other eyewitnesses in addition to myself would come forth who remembered the Auschwitz concentration camp as not being an "extermination camp."

Alas, my hopes were illusory. Had we Germans really, to use Lincoln's words, become "a nation of cowards" during the past decades? It appeared that this was the case! In any event, the smear campaign by nearly all the mass media which commenced against me only a few days after the appearance of my Auschwitz report had to be taken as an indication that further infractions of the Auschwitz taboo would be daring acts indeed. Although Christophersen's report was effectively killed by silence at the time, the Auschwitz myth-makers obviously did not want to put up with the circumstance that no less than a judge holding office was opposing their lies. The result was a further disciplinary proceeding against me, again with the objective of removing me from my judicial position. During the course of this proceeding it was suggested to me to leave the service voluntarily and that the proceeding could then be suspended. Since my health was no longer the best, simply as a result of the emotional disturbances and constant professional disadvantages connected with the first proceeding (ever after my acquittal), I finally took this "hint" and requested early retirement. Under such circumstances I in fact had little inclination to continue in my position as a judge. My request was granted at once. Presumably the judicial officials were happy to get rid of me in this manner. Nevertheless, the disciplinary proceeding was continued against me—now with the declared objective of disallowing my claims to a pension! Although the people prosecuting me did not attain this objective, my pension was nevertheless reduced by 20% for a period of five years.

Even though the financial disadvantages incurred by this proceeding were difficult for me, I was nevertheless happy to now be in the position of freedom from professional duties and restrictions, able to carry out what I had already begun by force of circumstances during the first proceeding: the scholarly examination of the Auschwitz problem. The attacks directed against me thus had set something positive in motion. They had become, as Goethe once expressed it [*Faust*, I, 1335-6], "a part of that force which constantly intends evil and yet creates good."

When I became certain, on the basis of my scholarly efforts, how impudently our German nation and the world had been deceived with regard to the treatment of Jews during the Third Reich, I resolved to publish the things I knew in the form of a

book. I was not willing to "sin by remaining silent." That was the hour of birth of my book, *Der Auschwitz Mythos*.

In this work I focused on the question of the alleged *mass gassings* because this is essentially the basis on which the "myth of terror" is founded. This restriction in scope to the *core* of the Auschwitz legend seemed appropriate to me in order to finally treat the basic problem as completely as possible—a treatment which had not yet been undertaken, even by the various revisionists.

At the beginning of my research I had, in my naive mind, actually planned to proceed as far as possible from the examination of primary sources. I soon became aware that this was practically impossible. This was mainly the case because the places where most of the *original* documents from the archives of the German authorities are kept are presently unknown. They may still be found, with some exceptions, in very many different foreign archives and even so can be located only with difficulty. Even the professional historians appear to have been hitherto scarcely concerned with this problem. In any event, the German historian Dr. Alfred Schickel, a moderate revisionist of the post-war generation, reported approximately two years ago in several German newspapers that the National Archives in Washington D.C. could be "a real bonanza" for every historian, but, nevertheless, remain scarcely used. There, according to Schickel, are kept amongst other things the archival materials and documents which were confiscated by the U.S. Army in Germany, including in some cases documents of which even the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz, and other West German archives, possess neither copies nor microfilms. Dr. Schickel reported further that the American experts had, however, waited in vain for the visits of German historians, although the Germans certainly had to be the ones who should be primarily interested.[2]

Schickel's assertions are proved correct when one goes through the literature on recent history. Today this history is still based essentially on the record books of the International Military Tribunal (IMT) in Nuremberg and of the subsequent trials (Nuremberg Military Tribunal, or NMT) which were carried out exclusively under American direction. Besides these records, photographic copies of alleged documents from various foreign (especially Polish or Jewish) archives are employed. Yet for a historian working on a scholarly basis, photographic copies cannot be a substitute of equal value for the original documents—this especially because they offer no guarantee of the authenticity of the documents and because the possibility of forgeries must be taken into account, particularly for the period of the Third Reich, 1933-1945. There are numerous examples of such

forgeries, one of the most recent being the forged "Hitler diaries."

For an outsider such as myself, extraordinarily limited moreover in his financial possibilities, it was naturally impossible under these circumstances even just to locate the primary source materials for the problem on which I was working. And I was not the recipient of any support from official or semiofficial offices—such as, for example, the Institut fuer Zeitgeschichte [Institute for Contemporary History] in Munich.[3] Although I was able to inspect a few copies of documents in the archives in the German Federal Republic, an inquiry from me to the Bundesarchiv in Koblenz concerning certain important original documents and other items was answered, for example, as follows:

> . . . to my regret I must inform you that the originals of the Nuremberg documents mentioned in your letter could not yet be located in the materials present in the Federal Archives. . . .
> Furthermore, concerning the originals of the documents employed in the Nuremberg trials, the quite general observation must be made that the tracing of places where they are stored involves considerable difficulties and problems as a matter of principle. Unfortunately, the ones specified by you are no exception.
> To the extent that documents were present in the original . . . they might be in American custody along with the originals of the trial records themselves or, for that matter, in the archives of the United Nations in New York. Some of them have also certainly been transferred to the trial representatives of the other participating nations and can be expected [to be found] today in their archives.
> The paths which the original documents took . . . can not be traced with absolute certainty . . .
> For thirty years now, the scholars of many countries and research organizations have also seen no reason to dispense with the form of the documents of the Nuremberg trials preserved and present in Nuremberg and other places as a quite important source of German history and to go back to the originals which are not easily accessible.[4]

All of this is quite revealing with regard to the question of the validity of the official or established postwar historiography—which, as we can see, is still almost exclusively dependent on the information supplied by the Nuremberg trials, not on any genuine critical scholarly research, even to the slightest extent. In view of these facts I can only be astonished again and again at the impudence of historians with a scholarly education who, primarily in the function of experts appointed by the courts, simply assert that the official version of the extermination of the Jews is based on "proved historical knowledge." The fact that German

courts constantly pay unlimited homage to this formula, although the so-called "information" upon which it is based appears absolutely grotesque, speaks less for the vaunted thoroughness of German judges than for their apparently unlimited opportunism. Involved also, perhaps, is the factor of a certain judicial confidence in the scholarly integrity of German professors, although this of course would hardly be in keeping with the critical stance which should be demanded of judges even in relation to supposedly expert witnesses.

And so a thorough historical examination of the Auschwitz problem would demand not only much time, but also much money. After my retirement I had the former but not the latter; my possibilities financially were extremely limited. Thus I had to rely during my work essentially upon the same source materials used by the established writers of recent history as the basis for their statements concerning the "extermination camp of Auschwitz." Here I made a virtue out of necessity, confining myself to examining the question as to whether this source material was at all valid. My method in this regard I have described in detail in my book, and so won't go into further detail here on this point. Suffice it to say that this method led to my conclusion that "the Auschwitz myth is rooted in the morass of inconsistent formation of legends, but not in actual happenings."[5] There is no significant evidence that in the Auschwitz region during the Second World War there took place by command from the highest echelons the planned, massive extermination of Jews by means of gas with the subsequent burning of the corpses so produced. I shall explain this conclusion below in greater detail by means of several examples.

In connection with this conclusion it is perhaps worth noting that one of the most famous and respected of West German historians, Dr. Hellmut Diwald, professor of history at the University of Erlangen, came to it himself (and at approximately the same time I did) in his book *Geschichte der Deutschen*. Therein he wrote that whatever happened to the Jews who were evacuated to the east after 1940 is "still unexplained with regard to the central questions, in spite of all that has been written."[6] By coming to this conclusion he caused a storm of indignation to issue from all Jewish organizations and their West German puppets. The Zionistically-minded press czar Axel Springer even dismissed the head of his corporation's publishing house, Propylaen, which had brought out Diwald's work; he further ordered the destruction of the stock of the original printing which had not yet been sold. In order to keep his academic position and to avoid a prosecution under criminal law, Diwald himself was compelled to rewrite completely the two pages in his book dealing with the persecution of Jews.

"Freedom of scholarly research" in West Germany in the year 1979!

Let us now consider the contents of my book. In it I arranged into three groups and discussed accordingly the types of source materials for the allegation of the extermination of the Jews which are of decisive importance in the opinion of the makers of the Auschwitz myth. These three groups were 1) documents, 2) reports dating from the postwar period of witnesses, and 3) evidence from the first Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial. I included in the first group only those documents (including written depositions) which came into existence at the time of the alleged happenings. These I designated "contemporary documents."

I included in my investigations the Auschwitz Trial (which is strictly speaking not a proper historical source at all) because the advocates of the extermination thesis rely more and more on this trial as an allegedly, even particularly, reliable source. Their reliance on a postwar *trial* for material upon which to base a claim of writing wartime *history* is not really so astonishing from their—or our—point of view, given that contemporary, wartime, documents concerning the alleged extermination of the Jews are almost entirely lacking or are at least very questionable. As regards the eyewitness reports published in the postwar period, these are not only all inconsistent with each other, but also claim things that are simply technically impossible. For this reason they are obviously not to be believed. Given, then, the generally ragged evidentiary situation, it was presumably the main objective of the Auschwitz Trial, as well as of all further trials of this kind, to make the extermination thesis incontestable, so to speak, by virtue of judicial authority. But it should be clear to historians working on a scholarly basis that judicial criminal trials are hardly suited to clearing up historical facts and connections. This fact was demonstrated by one of the most famous German professors of law, Dr. Beling, as early as the closing phases of the First World War in a journal article which remains quite pertinent today. [7]

It is naturally impossible within the limitations of this paper even just to hint at all of the questions and views treated in my book. Therefore I must confine myself to making a few important points.

With regard to the contemporary documents I would first like to mention the fact that in reality, and in spite of all the assurances of the advocates of the extermination legend, *there is not one single official written item from the time of the Third Reich which contains evidence of the alleged mass gassings of Jews.* In particular, there are no documents concerning the construction of gas chambers for the killing of human beings, or concerning

other technical arrangements which would have been necessary for this purpose. To just as slight an extent are there any directions concerning the use and servicing of such "death factories." Since the mass killings of human beings by means of gas, indeed even the killing of a single human being in this manner, requires unavoidable technical preparations which would quite certainly have to have been put down in writing in appropriate plans and directives, the utter lack of such written documents is certainly an important indication of the fact that such "gas chambers" for human beings did not actually exist. Furthermore, one must note that the advocates of the extermination thesis have hitherto studiously avoided even just touching on the question of the technical requisites for the claimed "gassings of Jews."[8]

Nevertheless these people do base their case on documents of various kinds (in addition, of course, to other things). However, and primarily for two reasons, these documents are not sufficient proof for such a monstrous claim.

In the first place, the documents can be made to serve the purposes of the extermination thesis only with the aid of arbitrary interpretations of terms. This is true of all documents in which there is talk of "resettlement of Jews, expulsion of Jews, deportation, evacuation" and similar things. The advocates of the extermination legend, accordingly, speak regularly of "code designations" or "code words" and "euphemisms" with which the authors of the documents were supposed to have intended to veil the "true situation," specifically the intended killing of Jews in "extermination camps." But it remains that this claim of "coded" intent must be designated as unfounded and misleading *as long as the question is unanswered as to when, where, and by whom these "code designations" were established and precisely how their supposedly true meaning was transmitted to the persons and military offices involved.* In other words: how the "code" was set up and run. As far as I can tell, the advocates of the extermination legend have not even posed this question, let alone answered it.

In the second place, a number of these documents give the impression of being forgeries. I wish to elucidate this point using the example of the so-called *Wannsee-Protokoll*, to the critical analysis of which I devoted quite a bit of space in my book. In the case of this document it is the matter of a later record of a conference of high German government officials presided over by the well-known *SS-Obergruppenfuehrer* Reinhard Heydrich. This conference is supposed to have taken place on the shore of the Great Wannsee in Berlin on 20 January 1942. The subject of the discussion was the "final solution of the Jewish Problem," as it was literally formulated in the introductory sentence of the "Pro-

tokoll." The sixteenth of the total of thirty copies of the document which were prepared was allegedly discovered shortly before the beginning of the Nuremberg (NMT) Wilhelmstrasse Trial, in the records of the German Foreign Office, by the representative of the American prosecutor's office in that trial. This representative was Robert M.W. Kempner, a former Prussian *Oberregierungsrat* [senior government councillor] who had emigrated to the United States for racial reasons during the 1930s. Since its discovery the *Wannsee-Protokoll* has generally been cited by the advocates of the extermination legend as the document with which the planned extermination of the Jews ordered by Hitler was initiated.

Now it is true that this document in fact contains no express indication of such an intent to exterminate. However, there are several sentences in it which when taken out of their context could make possible (if one wishes it) such an interpretation. Thus the following sentences have always been cited in the "Holocaust" literature only in their isolated form:

> In large labor formations and with a separation of the sexes the Jews will be led into these areas while they are engaged in building roads. During this a large proportion will doubtless drop out as a result of natural reduction. The remnant which is certain to remain in the end will have to be dealt with appropriately since it will doubtless be the most rugged component and since this component, representing a natural selection, will probably become the germ of a new Jewish structure after it is released. (Behold the experience of history.)[9]

The words "dealt with appropriately" are always interpreted in connection with the term "final solution" (which occurs rather frequently in the *Wannsee-Protokoll*) to the effect that those Jews who had not already perished by the hardships of their deportation and work were subsequently to be killed. In this way the impression is suggested that from the outset a complete extermination of the deported Jews had been planned.

But an analysis of the entire document shows that at least this part of it must be a forgery. Specifically, one must note that it is not at all in keeping with the rest of the text, appearing rather as a foreign entity in the context in which it occurs. Even the sentence stating that the Jews were to be led into the eastern areas "while they are engaged in building roads," during which "a large proportion will doubtless drop out as a result of natural reduction" does not make sense, because shortly before it the employment of these Jews as laborers in the eastern areas was given as the objective of their deportation. That is a contradiction in itself. One does not first attempt to exterminate people who are later supposed to work. (Surely they would then be rather inefficient laborers!)

The forgery simply cannot be overlooked, especially when one reads in connection with the quoted passages on page 8 of the record that the "evacuated Jews" of Europe were initially to be brought to so-called "transit ghettos" in order to be subsequently "transported to the east" from there. A "transportation" of the Jews into the eastern areas is certainly something quite different from leading them thither "while engaged in building roads"—not to mention the fact that in any case no such occurrance as the latter has become known. Again on page 14 of the record the "transportation problem" is expressly addressed. Thus in the original, genuine, text of the document the sentences quoted above can scarcely have been present. It must not be assumed that such highly qualified people as the participants in the Wannsee Conference would have decided on such contradictory nonsense.

There are still other points indicating a forgery of the document which, however, I cannot discuss completely here because of limitations of space. I do see the single most convincing evidence of a forgery in the point just discussed.

The anticipated objection that, in the case of a forgery, the "incriminatory" passages about a decision for the extermination of the Jews would have been expressed more directly and concretely, is not valid. Because at the time of the initial presentation of the document during the Wilhelmstrasse Trial there were still too many of the conference participants alive, all-too-crass, obviously bogus statements about the resolutions made there could not be risked. All of the participants in the conference interrogated by Kempner before the trial could recall only the fact that there was a discussion at the time concerning the employment of the Jews in the east as a labor force. That was also probably discussed in greater detail in the genuine document. I am therefore of the opinion that Kempner had the document brought into its present form *only after the interrogations of the participants in the conference* (which were, by the way, unsuccessful from his point of view), in order to be able to present it at the upcoming trial as a genuine-sounding proof of his extermination thesis. This is the case because without the few sentences in question the document would have been *entirely unusable for the proof of a planned extermination of the Jews.*

There is even material evidence of such hurriedly-accomplished forgery. Kempner published a reproduction of the 16th copy of the *Wannsee-Protokoll* in his book *Eichmann und Komplizen.*[10] I based the analysis in my book on this reproduction. In so doing I designated this reproduction as a "facsimile" of the document used as evidence in Nuremberg. I could so designate it because (as I have found out in the meantime) Kempner's

reproduction shows no similarity whatsoever, in typeface, to the alleged original of this 16th copy presently kept in the archives of the Bonn Foreign Office! In all probability Kempner presented his reproduction in the Wilhelmstrasse Trial as documentary evidence. Why would he have otherwise had it made up in the first place, and later even published it in his book? The primitiveness of this forgery could be caused by the fact that the time was not sufficient at first for a better job of forgery. The well-known temper and methods of the time of the Nuremberg trials would indicate that Kempner hardly had to fear a rejection by the court of this primitive forgery.

However, even the 16th copy kept in the archives of the Bonn Foreign Office cannot be the genuine document, although from a purely external point of view this copy might give that impression. It is indeed essentially similar in content to the Kempner reproduction, which is recognizable as a forgery. It must have thus been "doctored" in keeping with the Kempner reproduction, because it was naturally clear to the experts that Kempner's forgery, produced under the pressure of time, could not hold up indefinitely before the eyes of historians. The later forgers had time enough. According to information given me by the archives of the Foreign Office, this document was returned by the United States to Bonn in 1959 at the earliest.

There is moreover something else which appears worthy of mention in this connection. I have in my possession a copy of the 16th copy of the *Wannsee-Protokoll* which apparently originates from a document copy used in the Jerusalem Eichmann Trial. In any event, the heading of individual pages indicates that. Externally and as far as content is concerned, it is completely similar to the document kept in the archives of the Bonn Foreign Office *except for the fact that the type size of several pages varies from the rest of the type face.* Especially striking is the larger type face of page 8—the very page which contains the second, more important, part of those passages which in my view were manipulated into the genuine document replacing other passages. It may be that these variations originate from the use of various copying machines. But why, then, would various copying machines have been used for the copying of a single document in the first place? Were the copies of the pages which showed a different type size perhaps even made at another place? And why that? Could, perhaps, the forged parts be copied only at a certain place?

Questions and more questions, to which there are still no answers.

Naturally, it must not be ruled out that the indications enumerated by me of a possible forgery of the document might possibly

be attributed to other causes. However, for the historian they should be reason enough finally to demand the long overdue scientific testing of the physical document kept in Bonn. Only such testing could give a certain answer to the question of authenticity. Under the present conditions, to be sure, such an initiative is scarcely to be expected from German historians.

Now I come to the alleged eyewitness accounts concerning the claims of mass gassings in Auschwitz.

Recollections of contemporary witnesses have always been problematic as a historical source. Like all statements by witnesses, they are almost always more or less subjectively colored. Furthermore, with witnesses the question of their own involvements in the happenings plays a very special role. A person who has suffered generally has the inclination to exaggerate his suffering. Rassinier called this the "Odysseus Complex"—in recognition of the legendary fact that travellers returning from long journeys often tell tall tales. The person who has caused the suffering will generally attempt to palliate it or to shift the blame for it onto others (the so-called scapegoat theory). Further problems result from the facts that the human capacities for observation and recollection are quite limited, that witnesses can be influenced, that for particular reasons they knowingly lie, that they knowingly or unknowingly repeat as something that they have experienced themselves that which in fact they have only heard, and many other factors. Statements and reports of experiences by participants in certain happenings can therefore never serve simply by themselves as an objective portrayal of history.

In addition to this there is the fact that the question of the extermination of the Jews being considered here was from the outset and is burdened with considerable emotions and that officially, even to the present day, statements are allowed to be considered valid only to the extent that they are suitable in some way as support for the claims concerning the extermination of the Jews. My own case, which I described briefly at the beginning of this paper, is a typical example of this, the *double-standard*.

Now, indeed, those statements and reports which have contributed to the founding of the Auschwitz Myth will scarcely appear convincing to the objective historian who is working on a scholarly basis. This is the case because they not only contain contradictions and inconsistencies amongst themselves, but contain in some cases even *internal* contradictions. I have already mentioned that there is not a single report which even somewhat credibly describes the technical procedure of the mass gassing and of the subsequent destruction without a trace of the bodies. Each of these reports contains such crass impossibilities of a technical and physical nature that it is shown by this alone to be a lie.

In this connection I need only call to mind such "eyewitnesses" as Dr. Rudolf Vrba, Miklos Nyiszli, Kitty Hart or Filip Mueller, whose accounts are, in part, simply absurd. We need not waste another word concerning such accounts.

Perhaps for the reason of the self-evident absurdity of so many such accounts, reference is now—at least since the time of the Auschwitz Trial—almost exclusively made by the specialists in recent history (at least in our case in West Germany) to the Cracow memoirs of the commandant of Auschwitz, Rudolf Hoess, although these are, in part, no less absurd. They are, however, a psychologically relatively skilled mixture of "fiction and truth," so that an uncritical reader—and most readers do fall into that category—will probably take them on the whole as the authentic life-confession of Rudolf Hoess. Hoess wrote these memoirs, it is alleged, "voluntarily and without coercion" during his incarceration in Poland, before the Polish Supreme Peoples' Court sentenced him to death on 2 April 1947. On 16 April 1947 he died on the gallows at the place of his previous function as commandant, Auschwitz. Strangely, however, these alleged memoirs were not published until 1958, in German, and on the basis only of a photographic copy which the Poles had placed at the disposal of the present director of the Institut fuer Zeitgeschichte, Prof. Dr. Martin Broszat. The question as to why publication did not take place until eleven years after the writing, even though the memoirs are supposed to be an extraordinarily important historical source, has up till now been neither posed nor answered by the advocates of the extermination legend. [11]

In spite of their obscure origin there has also been no demand to this day for an examination of the original memoirs as to their authenticity. It indeed appears doubtful that the Poles would even grant such a request. Rassinier pointed out the practical impossibility of an examination of the original document. [12]

I was the first scholar to subject the Hoess memoirs to a detailed critical analysis as to their source. This analysis forms a particularly important aspect of my book. After it there can be no further doubt that in the case of parts which have to do with the mass extermination of the Jews, Hoess was either writing the document under coercion or those parts are a forgery which originated after his death. I am inclined toward the second possibility because, to mention only one reason amongst a number, the publication did not take place until a decade after the alleged writing of the document.

There are numerous indications of forgery in the document which I could not possibly discuss in their totality within the limitations of this paper. But it is particularly striking that in this autobiography there is not one word spent on well-known events

which must certainly have brought about considerable problems for Hoess as the commandant of the camp—events such as the great typhus epidemic around the middle of the year 1942 and the construction of the large crematoria in Birkenau. Hoess certainly would not have passed over these things in an otherwise quite detailed autobiography. It thus appears as if the sections in question were removed from the memoirs afterwards by another hand, and in their place inserted an account of the alleged extermination of Jews. Likewise, the separate description of "The Final Solution of the Jewish Problem in the Auschwitz Concentration Camp" possibly originated only after Hoess's death—despite its being dated November 1946.

I would like to go into another point in greater detail, which throws a characterizing light on our West German professors of history. On pages 270-72 of the German edition of my book I had called attention to a certain circumstance by pointing out various passages in the text of the Hoess memoirs which have to do with the extermination of Jews. We owe the discovery of this circumstance to our French friend Dr. Robert Faurisson. From these passages in the text it is learned that the so-called special command (*Sonderkommando*) is supposed to have entered the gas chamber as early as a half-hour after the Zyklon B was thrown into it, in order to take out the "gassed" Jews—entering so soon, however, without gas masks! No gas masks because the men of the special command—and this is the way it is literally put in the memoirs—were "eating and smoking" while in the chamber! That is, as we know, absolutely impossible on account of certain properties of Zyklon B. Dr. Faurisson has repeatedly written about this in the *Journal of Historical Review*.[13]

On account of these statements, the expert in recent history who gave testimony in the proceedings against my book relative to its being put on the prohibitional index, Prof. Dr. Scheffler, made the reproach to me that I had, by means of "evil methods of manipulation," attempted to confuse the public. He pointed out that the text passages quoted by me originated from various, separate parts of the Hoess memoirs. According to him, I had arbitrarily juxtaposed them and thus had "forged" them with regard to their actual meaning.

In so arguing Dr. Scheffler locked one of his own gates! On the two last pages of the alleged Hoess account, "The Final Solution of the Jewish Problem in the Auschwitz Concentration Camp," the impossible behavior of the men of the special command is again depicted, *this time in one section*. It is quite noteworthy that Prof. Broszat *left out* these two pages in his edition of the Hoess memoirs. Unfortunately, it was only after the appearance of my book that I was able to procure copies of them in a roundabout way. I could now make reference to them.

It is not difficult to imagine why Prof. Broszat failed to include these pages in his edition of Hoess's memoirs. Prof. Scheffler must also have known about these pages!

The guild of the experts on recent history is pronouncing its own sentence.

Now let us turn to the first Frankfurt Auschwitz Trial, the preliminary history and course of which I described in detail in the fourth chapter of my book. This trial achieved worldwide fame at the time, and that is indeed what it was supposed to do. It was a matter of a typical *show trial* after the model of the Nuremberg trials in the second half of the 1940s. At this point I will make some observations about this aspect and only about this aspect.

When I speak of the Auschwitz Trial as a show trial, I do not mean to imply that sentences of the 22 (ultimately 20) defendants had been decided from the outset. That was undoubtedly not the case; three defendants were even found innocent. In contrast to a widespread opinion, a predetermined judgement of the defendants is not the essential criterion of a show trial. Naturally, there are such trials with predetermined judgements, especially in the Communist countries. However, they also pursue an objective which goes beyond merely imposing a sentence on defendants: the objective of influencing or even intimidating the population, in keeping with the intentions of the political power clique which is always standing in back of such trials. In my book I designated this objective as "political demonstration effect." In my opinion *that* is the characteristic feature of every show trial. Thus, in a trial with an externally juridical form and always carried out before the broadest possible public, political objectives are pursued which in themselves are foreign to law and justice. The defendants in trials of this sort, then, have only the role of actors with mute parts.

The political demonstration effect of the Auschwitz Trial consisted of making clear to a perhaps still-doubting public once and for all, and with the aid of juridical authority, that Auschwitz was an "extermination camp" in which, according to plan, millions of human beings, Jews in particular, were killed in "gas chambers" and subsequently "destroyed without a trace" by burning. In fact nothing less was involved in this trial than the maintenance of the capacity to extort from the Germans politically and financially. One of the trial's initiators, the General Secretary of the International Auschwitz Committee in Vienna, Hermann Langbein, thus saw in it a "documentation of Hitler's largest extermination camp" which was supposed "to offer the possibility of an orientation and material for reflection to future historians, but especially to the young generation in Germany."[14]

The Auschwitz Trial attained its character of a show trial by virtue of the fact that the one contention of which proof should really have been established first of all *in this trial*, this unique opportunity—proof of the existence of "gas chambers" for the purpose of killing people—was considered by the court and all the trial participants as incontestable to begin with! I went into that matter in detail in my book.

Naturally, witnesses "confirmed" this contention on an assembly-line basis in their statements. Nevertheless, these witnesses would have been shown very quickly to be lying, and the ground removed from under the trial dogma, by depositions from experts concerning the properties and effects of Zyklon B, and the conditions necessary for its use. Also concerning: the efficiency and capacity of crematory installations, the possibility and effectiveness of cremation of corpses in the open, and many other matters of a technical and physical nature important in this connection. Such opinions of technical experts, however, were neither sought nor gathered by the court, even though this was its manifest duty.

The fact itself that the clarification of these pertinent questions was circumvented during the entire course of the trial demonstrates its character as a show trial. Contesting the dogma was not permitted, even though that dogma was the nucleus of the entire presentation, and its confirmation the real purpose of this monstrous trial! It can probably be doubted justifiably even today whether, indeed, the "results" of this embarrassing court trial will even stand the test before the eyes of future historians at a time when, as must be hoped, the study of history will again be free.

Let me finally make a few brief remarks about the consequences brought about in my country by the publication of my book *Der Auschwitz Mythos*. As far as I was concerned they were quite unexpected. When the book appeared in March 1979 I granted the publisher of a German monthly periodical an interview. Among the questions I was asked in it was whether, in view of the "Holocaust" hysteria, I did not have to fear "nervous reactions of government offices" or indeed even the book's confiscation. My exact answer to that question was:

> I am not really counting on that. The book is a scholarly undertaking. . . . Since I have also not put out into the world any assertions which cannot be proved, but have simply made a factual investigation of the foundations of the "Auschwitz Myth," I can really only imagine two kinds of reactions to my book. Either it is going to be killed by silence, like so many things which are not in keeping with the spirit of the times, or there will be a factual discussion of it just as I have done with the arguments of the

> opposing side. As a jurist I see no reason at all for its being confiscated. I would not know what criminal law I could have violated with this book.[15]

It turned out that I had great illusions. As early as 28 June 1979—that is, scarcely three months after the appearance of the book—the Bundesprufstelle fuer jugendgefaehrdende Schriften (Federal Office for the Examination of Publications Harmful to Young People) commenced a so-called "indexing procedure" on the basis of the law of 9 June 1953 concerning the distribution of publications harmful to young people. Such procedures may be entered against "publications which are capable of being morally dangerous to children and young people," as the law is worded. Included in these, according to wording, are "in particular immoral publications which have a brutalizing effect, incite people to a particular violence, crime or racial hatred, as well as those publications which glorify war." An indexing does not, it is true, have the effect of being a total prohibition of the indexed book, but it certainly does result in limitations of distribution and the prohibition of any advertising of the book. Indexed publications are thus practically excluded from sale on the open book market, which amounts, to a considerable extent, to a prohibition.[16]

Further, the prosecuting attorney's office of Stuttgart initiated a preliminary criminal procedure against my publisher and me on 23 July 1979, on account of alleged "distribution of propaganda materials of unconstitutional organizations" (§86 of the Criminal Code), "incitement of the populace" (§130 of the Criminal Code), and other provisions of criminal law allegedly violated by the book.[17] These accusations were of course farfetched. Apparently the public prosecutor who was dealing with the case under orders thought likewise and had the courage (which, unfortunately, cannot be taken for granted in the Bundesrepublik) not to bring any indictment. After about eight months he discontinued the litigation. In the meantime the statute of limitations had also taken effect in accordance with press laws.

However, that did not cause the opponents of my book to give up. The prosecutor's office was now directed by court order to seize the book. By a corresponding petition of the prosecutor's office and a judgement of 7 May 1982 it was sequestered on 31 July 1980 by the Stuttgart Landgericht (Regional Court), the equipment used for its production seized along with it. The Bundesgerichtshof (Federal Supreme Court) confirmed this action by its decision of 26 January 1983. Fortunately, only seven remaining archival copies were obtained from the publisher by the confiscation and seizure. The other 10,000 copies of the entire printing had already been sold because the indexing could not

take place until 11 March 1982, as a result of our delaying procedural tactics.

The mere fact of the unusually long duration, almost three years, of these two proceedings shows how difficult it was for the officials and courts involved to find an apparent legal basis for the measures taken. On the other hand, the quite unusual pressure which groups interested in removing the book from the German book trade knew how to, and did, exert also becomes apparent.

From the course of these two proceedings I would like to pick out two aspects which are especially worthy of mention. The one aspect is an expert's opinion concerning the scholarly value of my book which was given in the indexing procedure. The Bundespruefstelle had assigned Dr. Wolfgang Scheffler to prepare this opinion. This man is an expert on recent history who is well known from his testimony in many concentration camp trials. His expert's opinion reveals the *complete incompetency* of these experts in defending the Holocaust Legend against revisionist arguments. I have already demonstrated this by one example. I should also note that Scheffler needed no less than one-and-a-half years to prepare his "expert's opinion"! In spite of this, not much more than nonfactual polemics came out of his effort, which culminated in the assertion that my book is "extremely evil political [!] poisoning of the wells." In the further proceedings, as a matter of caution *no use* was made of experts' opinions on recent history, in obvious recognition of their obvious incompetency.

The other aspect is a noteworthy fact with regard to the book-seizure proceeding of the court: after approximately one year, by a threadbare pretext, the court excluded me—the author!—from further participation in the proceeding! Probably the court felt that it was no longer capable of dealing with my arguments. On account of this "refusal of due process," a protest by me to the Bundesverfassungsgericht (Federal Constitution Court) is still pending. However, on the basis of all the previous experiences with this court I hardly have any hope for success. (I had already twice tried in vain to obtain my constitutional rights there.) The seizure order will thus probably remain standing.

There was more. On 15 November 1982 the University of Goettingen initiated an academic proceeding against me for the purpose of depriving me of the doctoral degree granted me by the University in 1951. Although it should hardly be considered possible, this proceeding was based on a law signed personally, once upon a time, by Adolf Hitler! [18] The withdrawal of the degree took place by virtue of a resolution of the Council of Deans of the University on 29 March 1983, but it is not yet legally in effect. The clandestine rulers in our country had obviously decided that

after the destruction of the "dangerous" book (as the Stuttgart Landgericht put it), its author had also to be discredited and decredited in the eyes of the public, in order to make him seem untrustworthy in a scholarly sense once and for all.

Now, I myself have thus far simply taken all of this as a confirmation of the fact that at present there is no one in the position to refute my work by factual arguments. Naturally, the officials and courts involved in the various proceedings were just not able to do this. They did not even attempt it. The particular bases of the measures taken against me and my book are essentially as similar as one egg is to another. They do not concern themselves with the actual substance of the work at all, but use several of my expressions of opinion at the margin of the matter, or conclusions in the text of the book wrenched from context, in order to put together from these the criminal accusations of "incitement of the populace" (§130 of the Criminal Code) and "incitement to racial hate" (§131 of the Penal Code).[19] In addition there is naturally no forgetting to mention that the "extermination of millions of Jews" is an "established historical fact." In a quite fatal manner all this is reminiscent of the practices of the medieval Inquisition, except that a person is no longer *burned* as a "heretic." In place of the stake comes today the destruction of a person's means of making a living, and prison sentences or fines. My case will demonstrate whether in the future personal disgrace by the invalidation, in the case of academic people, of earned academic degrees will be routinely added as a "punishment."

Now, many of you will ask why all this is the case with we Germans, of all people, since for us, after all, the interest in exonerating our nation from the accusation of genocide would have to be dominant. There are many reasons for this case, of a factual and personal nature. In my view all of them can be summed up in one answer generally valid: We Germans, in spite of the repeated assurances to the contrary of our puppet politicians, are politically and intellectually no longer a sovereign nation since our defeat in the Second World War. Our *political* subservience, which is apparent in the fact of the breaking up of the Reich and the incorporation of the individual pieces into the extant power blocks of the East and of the West, has had as its consequence a corresponding *intellectual* subservience. Escape from this intellectual subservience is prevented primarily by the guilt complex inculcated in most Germans through the "re-education" instituted in 1945. This guilt complex is based primarily on the Holocaust Legend. Therefore for we Germans the struggle against what I have called the "Auschwitz Myth" is so frightfully important. I believe that this is also being increasingly recognized by the real human beings amongst us.

At this point I would like to express my grateful recognition of the fact that the German people are finding understanding and support amongst numerous citizens of those countries which were at one time enemies of the Reich in the frightful fraternal war of the Aryan nations. As representative of many people I might simply mention here the names Butz, Faurisson, and Irving. Their efforts in favor of historical truth appear to me to be of greater importance in determining their countries' respective national characters than the participation of those countries decades ago in the disgraceful Nuremberg show trials.

I began my paper with a quotation from your great President Lincoln. I want to conclude it with a quotation from my great compatriot, Goethe, as passed on down to us by his secretary, Eckermann. It is as follows:

> That which is true must constantly be repeated, because error is constantly being extolled all around us, and to be sure not just by individuals but also by the masses of people. In newspapers and encyclopaedias, at schools and universities, error prevails everywhere and it is well and comfortable in the sentiment of the majority which is on its side.

One must constantly repeat that which *is true!* Let us all act accordingly!

Notes

1. Since it was forbidden in the German Federal Republic, this booklet has been distributed with a new foreword by me by the Swiss publishing house Courier du Continent, Case Ville 2428, Lausanne, Switzerland. An English edition is available from Liberty Bell Publications, P.O. Box 21, Reedy, W. Va., 25270.
2. In this connection, see also Alfred Schickel, *Zeitgeschichte am Scheideweg* [Contemporary History at the Crossroads] (Wuerzburg: Verlag Johann Wilhelm Naumann, 1981), pp. 19ff.
3. Cf. Wilhelm Staeglich, *Der Auschwitz Mythos: Legende oder Wirklichkeit?* [The Auschwitz Myth: Legend or Reality?] (Tuebingen: Grabert-Verlag, 1979), Appendix I, pp. 367ff.
4. Original letter dated 26 January 1977 in the author's files.
5. Staeglich, p. 363.
6. Hellmut Diwald, *Geschichte der Deutschen* [History of the Germans], 1st ed. (Frankfurt, Berlin, Vienna: Propylaen-Verlag, 1978), p. 165.
7. *Deutsche Strafrechtszeitung* [Journal of German Penal Law], 1918, col. 199ff. The translated title of the article is: "Research in World History in the Court Room."
8. See Robert Faurisson: "The Mechanics of Gassing," *Journal of Historical Review* Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1980), pp. 23-30; "Confessions

of SS Men Who Were at Auschwitz," *JHR* Vol. 2, No. 2 (Summer 1981), pp. 103-36; "The Gas Chambers of Auschwitz Appear to be Physically Inconceivable," *JHR* Vol. 2, No. 4 (Winter 1981), pp. 311-17; "The Gas Chambers: Truth or Lie?," *JHR* Vol. 2, No. 4 (Winter 1981), pp. 319-73.

9. Staeglich, pp. 45-46.
10. Robert M.W. Kempner, *Eichmann und Komplizen* [Eichmann and Accomplices] (Zurich, Stuttgart, Vienna: Europa-Verlag, 1961), pp. 133ff.
11. Rudolf Hoess, *Kommandant in Auschwitz: Autobiographische Aufzeichnungen von Rudolf Höss*, with an introduction and commentary by Martin Broszat (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1958). The English edition is *Commandant of Auschwitz* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963).
12. Cf. Paul Rassinier: *Das Drama der Juden Europas* (Hannover: Hans Pfeiffer Verlag, 1965), pp. 54-55; *Was nun, Odysseus?* (Wiesbaden: Verlag Karl Heinz Priester, 1960), p. 61. An English edition incorporating these two works is *Debunking the Genocide Myth* (Los Angeles: Noontide Press, 1978).
13. See note 8.
14. Hermann Langbein, *Der Auschwitz-Prozess: Eine Dokumentation* [The Auschwitz Trial: A Documentation], vol. 2 (Frankfurt: Europaische Verlagsanstalt, 1965), pp. 907-08.
15. *Mut: Das nationaleuropaische Magazin* [Courage: The National-European Magazine] No. 139 (March 1979), pp. 18ff. This magazine is published by Bernhard C. Wintzek at Postfach 1, D-28kk, Asendorf, West Germany.
16. *Bundesgesetzblatt I* [Federal Law Record I], 1953, p. 377. This law was amended in various ways. The version valid at a given time is printed in the cumulative list of materials indexed by the Bundespruefstelle [Federal Examining Office]. This cumulative list is currently being published by the chairman of the Bundespruefstelle, Rudolf Stefen, in the Nomox-Verlagsgesellschaft, Baden-Baden.
17. §86 of the German Penal Code reads as follows in the part cited here by the prosecutor's office:

    Any person who

    1. . . .
    2. . . .
    3. . . .
    4. distributes or produces for distribution, keeps in stock or imports propaganda materials which are intended by their content to continue the activities of a former National Socialist Organization is punishable by imprisonment up to three years or by fine.

       Propaganda materials in keeping with Section 1 are only such publications (§11, Section 3), the content of which is directed against the free, democratic basic order or the principle of conciliation amongst the nations. . . .

    §130 reads as follows:

    any person who attacks the human dignity of others in a manner suited to disturb the public peace by

1. inciting hatred against parts of the population
2. demanding violent or arbitrary measures against them or
3. insulting them, maliciously making them the object of scorn or slandering them shall be punished by a prison sentence of three months to five years.

18. Law Concerning the Use of Academic Degrees, dated 7 June 1939, published in the *Reichsgesetzblatt I*, page 985.
19. §130 of the Penal Code: see note 17.
§131 of the Penal Code reads in those parts possibly applicable here as follows:
any person who
1. distributes,
2. . . .
3. . . .
4. produces written materials which . . . incite racial hatred shall be punished by a prison sentence of as much as one year or by a fine. . . .

The 90-minute cassette tape recording of Dr. Staeglich's conference lecture is available from the IHR at $8.95.

Karl Marx: Anti-Semite

JAMES B. WHISKER

Karl Marx was not only Jewish, he was descended from an established rabbinical family. His father had abandoned the practice of Judaism in order to function more freely in and with the newly established Prussian state, and in order to attract more clients to his law practice. Biographers do agree that age-old Jewish traditions continued to run deep in Herschel Marx's family long after he had ceased attending the synagogue. Karl Marx probably had no formal ties with Judaism, but he was acutely aware of its theology and its traditions. Lack of formal practice cannot here be equated with ignorance. Indeed, Karl Marx apparently had studied the bases of all Western religions throughout his life.

As a "Young Hegelian," commonly known as the Hegelians of the Left, Marx had been exposed to the often bizarre interpretations of organized religion. Among the earliest of his publications was *The Holy Family*, little more than a plagarism of the leftist Hegelian leader Ludwig Feuerbach's *Essence of Christianity*. It was in the juvenile *Holy Family* that Marx coined the oft-quoted phrase "Religion is the opiate of the people." The idea was hardly original with him. It was a reasonably cogent summation of one of the principal of Feuerbach's ideas, which was that man is alienated from himself by virtue of his dependence on God. By concentrating on God and by assuring himself that God will

right all wrongs and reward all sufferings in the next world, man is said to fail to realize that he can correct injustice and prevent the evils of the world in this world by and through his own efforts. Religion has a narcotic effect by soothing us so that we do not mind that we are miserable. All our sufferings, trials and tribulations, sorrows and despair are part of a divine plan wherewith we work out our salvation; thus they are to be accepted and cherished, not defeated or circumvented or prevented.

The Holy Family was an attack on all religion, without prejudice against any one specific variety. There was no real attempt in it to separate Christianity from Judaism. Inasmuch as many of the Young Hegelians were apostate Jews, some had shown especial concern for the status of Judaism, but not prejudice against Jews for religious reasons. Hence, in a sense, freedom from religion was really a form of release for Jews. These leftist followers of George William Frederick Hegel assumed that without any religion in the new state there would be no point of separation between Jews and Gentiles, ex-christians and ex-Jews. The onus of "Christ killer" would no longer be meaningful, any more than accusations levelled against any other group for killing any other individual or group of individuals. Indeed, Christ as a rejected symbol of false hope would be killed for a second time, and at least this second death would be the cause of liberation, rejoicing and new hope for the suffering masses. With most of this Marx could wholeheartedly agree. Christ had to die a second time, and this time there would be no resurrection. Marx agreed that without religion there could and would be no religious persecutions and prejudices. This was a sound example of an analytic logic in which he had great faith.

But there were parts of the argument put by the Young Hegelians with which Marx totally disagreed. And this disagreement marks the first clear-cut application of Marx's anti-semitism. The Jew would and could not change his character and habits any more than a tiger could shed its stripes. Marx concluded that Judaism was more than possible even without God, the Ten Commandments, the Ark of the Covenant, or the Bible. Judaism had nothing, or at least very little, to actually do with God or religion. It was essentially a *cultural* phenomenon, based on the acquisition of material wealth. It was a system of cultural and religious deception whose real concern was capital, bullion, currency—in short, whatever the coin of the realm or the currency of the era presented or valued. With this, Marx has a somewhat original idea to present to his fellow Hegelians of the Left. He had not merely copied this insight from Moses Hess, Bruno Bauer, Lorenz von Stein, or Feuerbach. He had added the popular perception of the times and, as an intellectual and a cultural and ethnic, if not

religious, Jew, he presented the argument in a form somewhat more articulate than that of the streetcorner pamphleteer.

The apostate Jew and direct descendant of a long line of rabbis, Karl Marx, had provided powerful ammunition for the Jew-baiter and the anti-semite among the apostate Jewish community of intellectuals at the German universities. He had spoken the unspeakable and had challenged the fundamentals of religion. He had in fact created a racist theory second to none among the intellectuals of the nineteenth century on the European continent. There is nothing in Arthur de Gobineau or in Houston Stewart Chamberlain that is more powerful or damning in its content with reference to Jews than Marx's *On The Jewish Question* (1843), also known as *A World Without Jews.*

This odd little book on the "Jewish Question" was written in response to Dr. Bruno Bauer's *The Jewish Question* (1843), also known as *The Capacity of Today's Jews and Christians to Become Free.* Marx's booklet has had a curious publishing history. The first unexpurgated English translation did not appear until made available through the clearly anti-Zionist Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow about 1955. Then the Philosophical Library published an English edition (1959) with a curious and apologetic introduction by the press's editor, Dagobert Runes. German and other editions are scarce, save for those distributed by the communist state press.

More intriguing than the scarce-availability of the book is the fact that most scholars have either seemed acutely unaware of its existence, or have simply chosen to ignore it. Certainly, the booklet does not fit in well with the secular humanistic and liberationist theological picture of Karl Marx as the great humanitarian and liberator of the oppressed. Truly, the work presents an obstacle. How can Marx be presented as the champion of all that is good and right in the world when he was in fact so unalterably opposed to Jews and Judaism? A passing remark here or there might be excused; a whole essay on—and *of*—nothing but anti-semitism is an entirely different matter and a more complex question. The liberal-left is no more able to cope with *A World Without Jews* than is the communist world able to deal with Marx's bitter attacks on Russia, in his several essays denouncing Russian communist movements which have been collectively published as *Marx Against Russia.*

Marx made specific charges against the Jews in his polemic. Jews worship Mammon, not God. Jews practice usury. Their true religion is predicated upon the acquisition of money through any and all means. The emancipation of all Europeans means the emancipation from Jewry: "emancipation from usury and money, that is, from practical, real Judaism, would constitute the eman-

cipation of our time." Jews seek to control the world through the control of money: "What is the object of the Jew's worship in this world? Usury. What is his worldly god? Money. . . . What is the foundation of the Jew in this world? Practical necessity, private advantage. . . . The bill of exchange is the Jew's real God. His God is the illusory bill of exchange." Marx further alleges: "Money is the one zealous god of Israel, beside which no other god may stand. Money degrades all the gods of mankind and turns them into commodities. Money is the universal and self-constituted value set upon all things. It has therefore robbed the whole world, of both nature and man, of its original value. Money is the essence of man's life and work which have become alienated from him: this alien monster rules him and he worships it."

It is from such statements as these, and from the basic tenets of *A World Without Jews*, that we discover some of the reasons for the mass appeal of National Socialism among the German working class to which Marxism-Leninism had once appealed. The fundamental and overiding racism of Marx himself helped to create an atmosphere in which Alfred Rosenberg's *Zur Protokollen wisen Zionismus* could be accepted. The anti-semitism of the master communist planner and theorist—and Jew—Karl Marx, helped to create the preconditions for the later acceptance of Alfred Rosenberg's many conclusions about Jews in *Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts*.

There is no clear and direct charge in *A World Without Jews* of a universal Jewish conspiracy. Marx's work lacks the charge of clear-cut direction of and central control over the Jewish community contained in *The Protocols of the Wise Men of Zion*. But only that separates the two works. Both agree in the fundamentals of a Jewish mammonistic approach to the world and its inhabitants. Both agree that Judaism is nothing more—or less—than a form of money-grabbing and money-worshipping secularism. Judaism's culture, the two works agree, is a pseudo-culture that seeks only material gain for its adherents.

Marx believed that man originally was good and that he naturally looked at all objects as an extension of his self. Objects were weighed according to the good that could accrue in the sense of self-fulfillment and in terms of providing a unified and integrated man, or, as Marx might prefer to put it, in terms of guaranteeing that man would not become alienated from himself. Alienation is the basis of man's illness, in the Marxist paradigm. The "Jewish mentality" that seeks only material gain from objects is necessarily productive of alienation. Man reduces objects to their monetary value. One does not keep that which has no value, unless he cannot sell it; one sells for money and for riches anything that he has, and disregards the cost in loss of self

(self-alienation). Marx charged that even mother or wife is thereby reduced to a monetary transaction, thought of in terms of gains and losses. "Even the relations between the sexes, between man and woman, becomes an object of commerce. The woman is auctioned off."

The world of aesthetics is reduced to a world of monetary gain. A painting is great because it can command a large price. An opera or other musical composition is judged according to its salability. Poetry and prose is to be valued for its market potential, not for its thoughts, expressions or beauty. Thus, a pornographic work may become greater than a true creation of inspired genius because its market potential is greater. Beyond market considerations, art has no value. Marx accuses the Jewish religion of having nothing but "contempt for . . . art, history and man." The Jew "cannot create a new world," be it an historical one or one of aesthetic escapism; he can merely calculate how the world might be turned into a profit. Other men create, while the Jew, Marx assures us, can only create *the marketplace* in which creative products are to be sold; he creates a scale of values by which to measure in terms of money the worth of a creation.

The rampant materialism which Marx abhored—despite his own materialism and economic determinism—was the work of the earth-centered Jew. Marx concluded that the Gentile had created capitalism, but the Jew had perfected its marketing potentials. In short: without the Jew, capitalism would have been an entirely different phenomenon. The Gentile had to *create* it because the Jew could not conceive any new worlds on his own, but the Jew could *turn* capitalism into a wholly materialistic and money-oriented system based on gain at any cost.

An obscure essay by Alfred Rosenberg, *The Earth-Centered Jew Lacks a Soul*, has much the same theme: The Jew made capitalism into an earth-centered system that is thoroughly dehumanizing. He had created an atmosphere in which he and many Gentiles operated. Competition forced the non-Jew to perform his business functions like the Jew—or fail. If the modern capitalist state would continue even without Jews, Rosenberg concluded, it would be as it is now because the Jew had removed the soul from the system. Economics was no longer moral; it was a system with no soul. It had been successfully divorced from moral philosophy. One knew Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*, but not his *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. If the capitalist system was to survive intact, in the form with which men were familiar, the Jew would survive as the archetype of the capitalist man.

Neither Rosenberg nor Marx attempted an apology for the status of the "earth-centered Jew." There was no historical trac-

ing of the *why* of it all: of the prejudices and restrictions that may have forced the Jew into money lending or commerce. The Jew was not as he was depicted by these critics because of conditions that were dehumanizing and beyond his control. The Jew was as he was, they agreed, because that is the way of all Jews: it is a racial-cultural characteristic that cannot in any way be altered or ameliorated.

A World Without Jews was not an isolated work in the sense that it alone contained Marx's anti-Jewish thoughts and positions. Other essays such as *The Class Struggle in France* and *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon* contained strong statements indicting the Jews for various crimes against humanity. Even in *The German Ideology* one finds occasional statements like "It is the circumvention of the law that makes the religious Jew a religious Jew." His dislike for rival socialist leader Ferdinand Lassalle prompted Marx to refer to that writer as "Juden Itzig [Jew-Nigger]."

What emerged from Marx was a clear condemnation of both Jews and Judaism. They had been wholly identified with all the worst elements of capitalism, most notably exploitation of the workers and the manipulation of money in the practice of usury. Marx did not state precisely whether he would have preferred a refabrication of society without the Jews or whether it would have been sufficient to merely remove the "Jewish mentality." The portion of the communist program relating to the confiscation of alien property, as given in Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto*, has been thought by some to relate to the expropriation of Jewish property. This is debatable, but it is a curious addition to that document, whatever the rationale for its inclusion. The overall weight of evidence suggests that the "liberation from Judaism" of which Marx wrote so often is the liberation of society generally from Jews, rather than the liberation of Jews from an earth-centered climate of opinion. "The emancipation of our time," Marx wrote, "means the emancipation from practical Jewry."

We must not think of Marx's racism as confined merely to his baiting of Jews. Marx was a true European of his time, and for him no race save the Caucasian had established itself, committed deeds that might be recorded in history. The yellow and black races were definitely excluded from history, having had no role in the development of the world or of the idea of history.

Marx never, however, wrote anything attacking other races or peoples comparable to his attacks on the Jews. There exists bits and pieces of racist rhetoric, such as his use of the term Itzig, which can be translated best as "nigger." Even had Marx been a more productive and wide-ranging writer, and his attention been drawn more to other nations and other peoples, there seems little

doubt that he would indeed have shrunk away from writing something such as Carlyle's *Disquisition on the Nigger Question*.

A careful reading of Marxism does reveal what, though not explicitly stated, Marx's "line" was on these matters. The Proletarian Revolution will not occur in nations of the undeveloped, non-Caucasian (as we call it now, Third) world. Marx often named the nations in which his thought and prognosis were applicable: Germany, France, Great Britain, the United States, Belgium, the Netherlands, Holland, and other European or Caucasian nations. Marx never included in his grand schematic the nations of the Far East, Latin America or sub-Saharan Africa.

The exclusion of Russia from his system provides a good insight into his thinking. If Russia was to be considered a European nation then it might, at least one day in the future, be subject to the dialectical and historical stages of progress and development through which the remainder of the European nations had passed or were passing. If Russia were, however, *Asiatic*, at least in the main, it would not pass through the stages and progressions of other nations built and inhabited by Caucasians.

The man who invented the Dialectic, G.W.F. Hegel, had made no provision for applying the dialectical operations of his *Weltgeist* (World-Spirit) to nations other than those traditionally grouped as "Western Civilization." Marx did not choose to alter this in his own construction. If the Dialectic does not operate in a nation, that nation is quintessentially outside history. Events still occur and time passes, but nothing of true historical meaning or value can pass.

It remained for other Marxist-socialist theorists to excise or cover-up the racist remarks in the writings of Karl Marx, and to establish a worldwide appeal for Marxism. Friedrich Engels was able to establish something of a historic and revolutionary role for Third World nations, and Lenin included them in his *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*. The German socialist Eduard Bernstein removed anti-semitic remarks from Marx's *Letters to Engels*. It remains that *A World Without Jews* is unknown to all but a handful in the West. Racist remarks in other of Marx's works have been excised by sympathetic editors or passed over apologetically with the flip explanation that Marx was doing nothing more than reflecting the prejudices of his time and place.

But Soviet communism has in fact returned to its anti-semitic roots. Theoretically the Soviet communist state allows the practice of Judaism, while opposing political Zionism. And it is most interesting that the distinction made in Soviet Russia and in other communist satellite nations between the "Sabbath Jew" and the "Zionist Jew" is remarkably similar to the distinction made in National Socialist Germany between the practicing Jew and the earth-centered, irreligious Jew.

Bibliographical Note

The primary source for the racist theories of Karl Marx is his *A World Without Jews* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), which was edited and translated by Dagobert D. Runes. Since Runes made reference to the official Soviet edition of the same work we may safely assume that this undated edition published by the Foreign Languages Publishing House in Moscow was done before 1959. Of the other works in which Marx made passing references to Jews, editions abound. These works include: *The German Ideology*, *The Class Struggle in France*, *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Napoleon*, and *Letters to Engels*. Many of the letters were published in L. Feuer (ed.), *Marx and Engels: Basic Writings on Politics and Philosophy* (Anchor Books). The Foreign Languages Publishing House editions of Marx's many works tend to be accurate and inexpensive.

One of the first discussions in English of Marx's anti-semitism was Zygmund Dobbs, "Karl Marx: Father of Modern Anti-Semitism," *Plain Talk* (September 1949). The fundamental secondary source for Marx's racism and anti-semitism is Nathaniel Weyl, *Karl Marx: Racist* (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1979).

On the parallels to Alfred Rosenberg in National Socialist Germany, consult Rosenberg's *The Myth of the Twentieth Century* (Torrance, Calif.: Noontide Press, 1982). Rosenberg's essay "The Earth-Centered Jew Lacks a Soul" is found in George Mosse, *Nazi Culture* (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1966) and in J.B. Whisker (ed., trans.), *National Socialist Ideology: Concepts and Ideas* (Croonsboro, North Carolina: W.U.N. Press, 1979).

Hitler, the Unemployed and Autarky

SOME OBSERVATIONS AFTER 50 YEARS

RUDOLF JORDAN

Translated and with a Commentary by Ronald Klett*

In Germany and throughout the democratic world the problem that disturbingly dominates politics today is rising unemployment and its simple cause, lack of jobs for the work force available. The worker has a right to employment. In place of the long postwar period of economic growth in Germany, known as the *Wirtschaftswunder*, which saw some 4.8 million foreign workers attracted to the country, the situation now is that nearly 2 million German workers seek employment and cannot find it. Their desperation today echoes events that profoundly impressed Germany and Europe—indeed, the world—half a century ago, when the words "Hitler *ante portas*" resounded at a time when Germany was on the edge of final collapse.

What was the situation at that time? The President of the Reich, Hindenburg, appointed Adolf Hitler as Chancellor on 30 January 1933. In his subsequent address to the German nation, Hitler stressed that two problems were the most serious of all those burdening German society. Their solution demanded the

* Translator's Note: This article originally appeared as "Das Gespenst der Arbeitslosigkeit: Wie es vor 50 Jahren verjagt wurde," in the quarterly *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* Vol. 30, No. 3 (1982), published by the Grabert Verlag at Postfach 1629, 7400 Tuebingen 1, West Germany. In this free translation I have expressed the German unemployment in per cent, added the comparable unemployment statistics for the United States (as published by the U.S. Department of Labor), and converted the Reichmark into U.S. Dollars at the official rate of one RM = 23.8 cents.

nation's complete attention and energy. In the clearest possible terms Hitler stated these two problems: unemployment, and the plight of the peasant. Both rose like specters out of the ruins of the Weimar Republic. Both called nationalists and socialists alike to action.

Just how serious were the circumstances in Germany? Between 1929 and 1932 the yearly average of the officially recognized unemployment rose from 1.8 million to the startling figure of 6.1 million, out of a work force of 18 million—an unemployment rate of 34%. The figure of 6 million was reached as early as February 1932, which saw the workless standing in long lines outside the government employment offices. Berlin, capital of the Reich, had a population of 4.2 million, of whom 650,000 were out of work (almost 11% of total German unemployment, although Berlin held less than 7% of the German population). These piteous numbers actually understate the misery, because farm laborers and domestic help were not included in unemployment statistics. To these figures must be added the 3 million of those working in December 1932 who were only working short hours.

About *one-third* of the German work force in 1932 had no active role in the nation's economy. The income of the employed fell from $5.7 billion in 1929 to $2.62 billion in 1932. Income tax statistics tell us that of about 31 million Germans drawing an income, 69.2% received less than $286 yearly; 22.7% received between $286 and $714 yearly; only 8.1% received more than that. Of a work force of 18 million, about 12 million had jobs. Of the six million workless, more than one-third were excluded from unemployment insurance and emergency unemployment relief. As welfare recipients, they were given an average of $13.09 monthly. The consequence was that the state in 1932 doled out about 16% of all salaries and wages, or 9% of the total income of the German people.

The following table makes plain the unprecedented success of the National Socialist attack on unemployment, and compares it with the situation at the same time in America.

Date		German Unemployed (Millions)	United States Unemployed (Yearly Average)
1933	31 January	6.019 or 33%	1932 - 23.6%
1933	30 June	4.856 or 27%	1933 - 24.9%
1933	31 December	4.059 or 23%	1934 - 21.7%
1934	30 January	3.773 or 21%	1935 - 20.1%
1934	31 June	2.880 or 16%	1936 - 16.9%
1935	31 January	2.947 or 16%	1937 - 14.3%
1935	30 June	1.710 or 9.5%	1938 - 19.0%
			1939 - 17.2%
			1940 - 14.6%

In early 1938 (before the union with Austria), the statistically unemployed in Germany numbered only 507,000 or 2.8%—a figure that Roosevelt's New Deal did not equal until February 1943, a good 14 months after the United States had formally entered the war.

After World War II Germany's extraordinary socialist achievement was belittled by the use of fantastic lies. People were told that the 1930s success owed solely to the rearmament that supposedly began immediately after Hitler had assumed office. But when we realize *when* in fact real rearmament and remilitarization began, we can see that the foregoing table tells a very different story. When universal conscription was introduced at the end of 1935, more than 4 million of the previously unemployed were *already* earning a living again. At the end of 1938 the Minister of Labor reported that over 1 million jobs were going begging. There no longer was any unemployment: the problem from then on was a *shortage* of workers.

The unique success of the German attack on unemployment did not owe to some "solitary decision" made in the highest circles of government, but instead to an ideal partnership of "team spirit" which included the state, industry, the party, and the workers themselves. Political leaders sat down with the relevant economic specialists to realize in practice what specialists had recommended in the light of their experience. To master the crisis and to create jobs, the state spent an additional $1.33 billion during this period—that is, up to 1935. The creation of jobs turned on this settled rule of action: "First, to each a job, and thereafter to each *his* job." (How in contrast this attitude is to todays "welfare-ethic"!) The full significance of the feat accomplished from 1933 to 1935 can be truly understood only when considered in light of the political situation abroad, marked as it was by the *first* declaration of war against Germany, which the London *Daily Express* of 24 March 1933 announced on page one with the headline "Judea Declares War on Germany." What this actually meant for Germany's new beginning is found in the text of the article:

> Entire Israel the world over closes ranks to declare economic and financial war on Germany. . . . Fourteen million Jews, in every corner of the world, have united as one to declare war on the German persecutors of their co-religionists. . . . Germany will have a high price to pay. The Reich is faced with a complete boycott in commerce, finance, and industry. [retranslation]

What Germany in fact achieved—this "declaration of war" notwithstanding—was admiringly acknowledged abroad (Churchill, for one, in England), and at home by one of the leading

German economic theorists, whose membership in the present [until late 1982] ruling party [Social Democrats] in West Germany adds a "democratic" legitimacy, should that be required, to his views. In 1935, while a student in the University of Heidelberg, he wrote his doctoral thesis (honored with the *summa cum laude*) entitled *Work Creation and Financial Order*. To quote from it:

> The German organized attack on unemployment has raised and expanded the concept of jobs creation from its literal meaning of relief work to something beyond mere stimulation of the economy, until there is an overlapping contribution from all the forces of economic life. . . . After the statutory beginnings in June 1931 and July 1932, and after the National Socialist revolution, the effort developed into a comprehensive service and educational undertaking of the whole nation: the crowning achievement of this undertaking was that it dutifully drew the workers into it.

Who will want to contradict the former Federal Minister for Economic Affairs under Helmut Schmidt—namely, Prof. Dr. Karl Schiller, member of the Social Democratic Party? Yes, he was the author of the expert evaluation above. Those of us who went about our work in those days fully conscious of carrying out a nationalist and socialist revolution see in this Social Democrat's 1935 words a ringing confirmation of this part of our intention.

COMMENTARY
by Ronald Klett

Why was National Socialist Germany so spectacularly successful in restoring full employment, whereas the major democracies—the United States, Great Britain, and France—had to employ a world war to end their economic miseries? [1] Strangely —or perhaps not so strangely—this question is rarely asked. Rudolf Jordan has just provided part of the answer, as also Prof. Dr. Schiller. Hitler himself answered the question. Chatting with his circle of guests on the evening of 12 November 1941, he said: "This is the secret of my Four Year Plan: I have woven the people into an autarkical economy! I did not solve the problem [of unemployment] through war industry." [2] The fashionable view, in America as in Germany, is that the National Socialists achieved full employment by converting Germany into a fortress. The English historian A.J.P. Taylor spoke just this typical view: "The full employment which Nazi Germany was the first European country to possess depended in large part on the production of armaments; . . ." [3] But his next clause modifies this claim: ". . . ; but it could have been provided equally well (and was to some extent) by other forms of public works from roads to great

buildings." His following sentence further dilutes the claim: "The Nazi secret was not armament production; it was freedom from the orthodox principles of economics." Taylor belabors the point quite needlessly, because 29 pages earlier he had obligingly (although perhaps unwittingly) strangled fashion in the womb: "Even in 1939 the German army was not equipped for a prolonged war; and in 1940 the German land forces were inferior to the French in everything except leadership."[4] If German "full employment depended in large part on the production of armaments," should not Germany in 1939 have been "equipped for a prolonged war"? Should its land forces in 1940 have been "inferior to the French in everything except leadership"? The actual statistics, cited by economic historian John Kenneth Galbraith, answer these two questions:

> Even in May 1940 the [German] arms industry accounted for less than 15 per cent of total industrial production [this, eight months after the war's beginning!]; by 1941 the figure was 19 per cent, by 1942 26 per cent, by 1943 38 per cent and finally in 1944 it reached 50 per cent.[5]

The answer to the basic question, raised in the first sentence of this commentary, has three basic parts: 1) Keynesian deficit spending (Jordan's view, and Galbraith's); 2) The workers drawn in to the economy to become an enthusiastic part thereof (Prof. Dr. Schiller); 3) Autarky, insofar as possible (Hitler). A.J.P. Taylor notwithstanding, the armaments industry was an inconsequential factor in German full employment. But Taylor could have pointedly aimed his claim at the *democracies* both during and after World War II.

In the closing chapter of the second volume of *The Decline of the West*, Oswald Spengler, in his inimitably fascinating and perspicacious way, weighs the frenzied private commercial activity required to float the modern economy:

> . . . The ancient wrestle between the productive and the acquisitive economies intensifies now into a silent gigantomachy of intellects, fought out in the lists of the world-cities. This battle is the despairing struggle of technical thought to maintain its liberty against money-thought.
>
> The dictature of money marches on, tending to its material peak, in the Faustian Civilization as in every other. And now something happens that is intelligible only to one who has penetrated to the essence of money. If it were anything tangible, then its existence would be for ever—but, as it is a form of thought, *it fades out as soon as it has thought its economic world to finality*, and has no more material upon which to feed. It thrust into the life of the yeoman's countryside and set the earth a-moving; its thought transformed every sort of handicraft; to-day it presses victoriously

> upon industry to make the productive work of entrepeneur and engineer and labourer alike its spoil. The machine with its human retinue, the real queen of this century, is in danger of succumbing to a stronger power. But with this, money, too, is at the end of its success, and the last conflict is at hand in which the Civilization receives its conclusive form—the conflict *between* money and blood.

He was writing immediately after World War I, 65 years ago—when economic activity was far less the fever it is today. The implication of his words reminds us that every fever has its end. There is a hidden juncture at which the fresh increments of human energy, resourcefulness, vision, inventiveness, courage, resolution, farsightedness, toil, optimism, and speculation—ingredients essential to sustaining commerce at the desired level or to screw it up to an even higher pitch—mysteriously lack their customary potency or even fail utterly to be present. At this juncture the terrifying descent begins: an adventure the beginnings of which cannot be many years in the future. As part of the next great historical movement, the world—not Germany alone—will return in its respective parts, be these nations or groups of nations, to autarky, as Hitler sensibly desired for the German people. Sometime in the future our interdependent national economies, at present susceptible to paroxysms of shivering from every major storm abroad, will be looked upon as the superstition they always were: the twentieth century myth of the Fountain of Youth. By the early 1930s this fountain had run dry for Germany. Now it runs dry for the world. The German example in coping with, and superceding, this problem will not be forgotten.

Notes

1. For the democracies, World War II was, in the economic sense, a marvelously efficacious genie. American economist John Kenneth Galbraith is refreshingly blunt about it: "The [American] Great Depression did not, in fact, end. It was swept away by World War II." *Money: Whence It Came, Where It Went* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1975), p. 234.
2. Adolf Hitler, *Monologe im Fuehrerhauptquartier 1941-1944: Die Aufzeichnungen Heinrich Heims herausgegeben von Werner Jochmann* (Hamburg: Albrecht Knaus Verlag, 1980), p. 137. The Four Year Plan Hitler refers to was the second, announced in 1936, which was to establish a largely autarkical German economy. Hitler, fully aware of the increasingly menacing attitude of neighboring countries, also instructed Goering that the Germany economy and armed forces were to be ready for war by 1940. These instructions were not fulfilled.
3. A.J.P. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War* (New York: Atheneum, 1962), p. 104.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 75.
5. Werner Maser, *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial* (New York: Scribners, 1979), p. 138. The abundant additional war production statistics quoted by Maser in this paragraph overwhelm the reader with what is already obvious. For a fascinating light on Germany's alleged readiness for general war in 1939, and a complete refutation of this allegation, one should consult the testimonies at the Nuremberg International Military Tribunal of General Karl Bodenschatz, Field Marshal Erhard Milch, and Colonel-General Alfred Jodl; see pp. 127-30 and 136-39 of Maser's book. A most detailed and informative review of Germany's readiness for war in 1939, as compared to the readiness of her surrounding enemies, is found in the chapter "The German Standard of Armament in the Year 1939" in Udo Walendy, *Truth for Germany: The Guilt Question of the Second World War* (Vlotho/Weser: Verlag fuer Volkstum und Zeitgeschichtsforschung, 1981), pp. 256-90. Although Galbraith commits the error of implying that military spending played a more important role than it actually did, his remarks on the National Socialist economy before and during the war are attractive for their overall sanity: *Money*, pp. 225-26; *The Affluent Society* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1958), pp. 162-63.

REVIEW ARTICLE

Stalin's War: Victims and Accomplices

CHARLES LUTTON

STALIN'S SECRET WAR by Nikolai Tolstoy. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1981, 463pp, $18.50, ISBN 0-03-047266-0.

PAWNS OF YALTA: SOVIET REFUGEES AND AMERICA'S ROLE IN THEIR REPATRIATION by Mark R. Elliott. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982, 287pp, $17.95, ISBN 0-252-00897-9.

Our "present" has to a large degree been shaped by the events of 1939-45. The outcome of the contest between Stalin and Hitler, as "relevant" to so many of our contemporaries as those earlier struggles between Persia and Greece or Carthage and Rome, does cast its shadow over our lives. Count Nikolai Tolstoy, in his latest book, sets out "to interpret Soviet policy, internal and external, during the crucial years 1938 to 1945. Above all, I have tried to lay bare how Stalin himself saw events and reacted to them." The author draws on much new material, as well as on evidence long before available but often "overlooked" in previous publications of other writers, to suppport his conclusions in what is a significant contribution to our knowledge of the Second World War on the Eastern Front.

It is Tolstoy's contention that Stalin was haunted by the fear that the Communist state was essentially a house of cards that could easily collapse. His overiding concern was to shore up the position of the regime, largely through a policy of terrorizing the various peoples who inhabited the USSR.

The first four chapters review Stalin's pre-war management of the Soviet Union. The "New Society" so admired by many Western intellectuals was an unrestricted police state, run by perhaps

the foulest collection of congenital criminals ever assembled (thus far). Its economy rested upon the output of 15-20 million slaves, laboring in Siberia and mines in the Arctic Circle, where the annual death rate of 50-70% far surpassed that of any previous slave society. Stalin's Russia was a land with three categories of citizens: prisoners, former prisoners, and future prisoners. There was scarcely a family that had not been touched by the secret state police (NKVD). For the overwhelming majority living in the USSR, conditions were far worse than they had ever been under the Romanovs. In Tolstoy's view, "Stalin's great achievement was to place the entire population of nearly two hundred million people wholly in the power of the police, whilst himself retaining in turn absolute power over the police."

The author explains that Stalin was consumed by the fear that, given an opportunity, his hapless subjects would rise up against the Communist dictatorship. After spending a year in the Soviet Union, an American diplomat concluded that "Not very much leadership would be required to start a counter-Stalinist revolution. . . . Many people have come to believe if Germany turned eastward she could find enough people in Russia who were fed up with present rulers to welcome any outside aid, even from the Germans."

Part Two, the major portion of the book, deals with Stalin's diplomatic maneuverings and wartime direction of internal security and military affairs. In August 1939, while Western diplomats were engaged in negotiations with the Soviets, Stalin signed non-aggression and trade agreements with Hitler. These benefited both parties: Germany, for the time being, was able to concentrate her slender military resources against a recalcitrant Poland and Britain and France, and also received food, oil, and other supplies from the USSR. In exchange, the USSR obtained technical aid and freedom to enlarge her sphere of influence at the expense of Poland, Rumania, the Baltic states, and Finland. In the newly absorbed areas most vestiges of Western culture were extinguished. The author describes what happened when the Russians invaded Poland in September 1939:

> As the Red Army edged nervously up to the demarcation line, terrified lest the Wehrmacht change its mind and roll onwards, thousands of NKVD troops spread over the defenseless countryside behind. The Red Army confined itself to rape (old women were the principal victims, owing to a belief that the rapist would live to the age of his victim; as a result ninety-year-old women were frequently raped over and over again), and pillage. Even the pillage was occasionally restricted by the invaders' blank terror when faced with astonishing devices like electric irons. . . . It was the NKVD, however, which struck real fear in the Poles. Arriving a few days after the "regular" troops, they set up headquarters in every town, working by preference at night-time . . .

The NKVD had categories of citizens subject to immediate arrest, from aristocrats and priests to Red Cross officials and even stamp collectors. Men were separated from their wives and children and those who were not executed upon arrest were shipped off to the slave-camps of GULAG, where they were litterally worked to death. The pattern was the same in the Baltic states. Tolstoy reveals that about one-tenth of the population of the newly occupied countries was deported. A Jewish Zionist who had looked with favor upon the USSR "as a great social experiment" only to end up in the GULAG camps himself for four years, declared after his release:

> Russia is indeed divided into two parts, the "free" Russia [and] the other Russia—the second Russia, behind barbed wire—is the thousands, endless thousands of camps, places of compulsory labor, where millions of people are interned. . . . Since they came into being, the Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have exacted more victims, than all other camps—Hitler's and the others—together, and this lethal machine continues to operate full-blast. . . . An entire generation of Zionists has died in Soviet prisons, camps, and exile.

Tolstoy remarks that "History is accordingly presented with the extraordinary fact that Jews resorted to bribery and other desperate measures in efforts to escape from Soviet territory to the tender mercies of the Nazis."

Stalin still moved with caution in 1939-40. He feared that Germany, which served as a buffer from the Arctic Ocean to the Balkans, might be defeated by France and Britain, thus jeopardizing his own conquests. It seems that he breathed a sigh of relief once France capitulated in June 1940.

Hitler, who had made a career out of opposition to Bolshevism, decided to launch a pre-emptive attack on the USSR following Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov's visit to Berlin in November 1940. Molotov presented a long list of Soviet territorial "interests," which included the Petsamo nickel deposits in Finland, the Baltic Sea up to the sound between Norway and Denmark, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey. Later that month, at a meeting with German Ambassador Count von der Schulenburg, Molotov added other regions to the list. Hitler, long uncomfortable with the Soviet pact, had come under increasing criticism from Mussolini for seeming to abandon the anti-Communist struggle.* Stalin's new territorial demands decided

*In a long letter to Hitler dated 3 January 1940, Mussolini warned Hitler of the danger of pursuing a war with the Western powers without taking into account the threat posed by the Soviet Union. Criticizing Hitler for the August 1939 pact with the USSR and accusing him of abandoning anti-Communism, the Italian Duce wrote:

the matter, as Hitler concluded that "they were thoroughly untrustworthy allies, who would seize the first opportunity of profiting by a German reverse to move forward into Europe. This is what he had always known and prophesied." On 18 December 1940, Hitler released War Directive No. 21, Operation *Barbarossa*, which ordered the invasion of Russia the following Spring. Tolstoy notes that Stalin, who had enjoyed a number of diplomatic successes up to that time, had over-reached himself: "The Soviet tactic (well-nigh universally employed) of demanding twice what they wanted and being content with half, had for once gone seriously astray. Hitler had no intention of conceding anything to an ally whom he rated many degrees lower than Mussolini, and was angered by what he saw as an emerging Soviet threat."

As has long been known, Stalin received numerous warnings about an impending German attack, including those from his master spy in Japan Richard Sorge. (On this point see General Charles A. Willoughby, *Shanghai Conspiracy: The Sorge Spy Ring*, E.P. Dutton, 1952.) Even after Germany and her anti-Comintern allies Rumania, Hungary, Finland, and Slovakia launched their invasion of Russia in June 1941, Stalin's primary fear was not of his foreign enemies but of the Russian people themselves. During the first weeks of the attack "the country seemed to be disintegrating precisely in the manner his worst nightmares had foretold."

The "secret war" Tolstoy goes on to vividly describe was the fierce campaign Stalin waged against the Russian population—a struggle which often took priority over pressing military problems. For example, Stalin tied up much of the rail network in western Russia with slave trains of captives from the Baltic states, instead of devoting all rolling stock to the reinforcement of the frontlines. At L'Vov, where the Soviet 4th Army was fighting

---

> You cannot permanently sacrifice the principles of your Revolution to the tactical exigencies of a certain political moment. I feel that you cannot abandon the anti-Semitic and anti-Bolshevik banner which you have been flying for twenty years and for which so many of your comrades have died; you cannot renounce your gospel. . . . Permit me to believe that this will not happen. The solution of your Lebensraum problem is in Russia and nowhere else. . . . Germany's task is this: to defend Europe from Asia. That is not only Spengler's thesis. Until four months ago Russia was world enemy number one; she cannot have become, and is not, friend number one. . . . The day when we shall have demolished Bolshevism we shall have kept faith with our two Revolutions. It will then be the turn of the big democracies, which cannot survive the cancer which is gnawing at them and which manifests itself in the demographic, political, and moral fields.

Department of State, *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945*, Series D, Volume VII, pp. 604-609. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

desperately to prevent its surrender, Stalin's major concern was that the NKVD finish liquidating potential Ukrainian opponents of the regime rather than order the local security forces to join in the battle against advancing Axis units. While Stalin pleaded with the British to rush more aid and take further action, the NKVD labor camp guards were doubled in number from 500,000 to one million heavily armed men.

Standard treatments of this period always claim that the Soviet Union lost over 20 million people during the Second World War. Tolstoy makes a convincing case that the actual total is probably closer to 30 million, maybe even more—with about a third of these deaths attributable to Axis actions. The blame for as many as 23 million deaths is placed with Stalin and his NKVD henchmen.

Casualty figures for the Eastern Front have been estimated as follows: two and a half million German soldiers died in the East. It is believed that three Red Army men died for every German soldier killed. Of those 7,500,000 military deaths, approximately three million Russians died as POWs.

Tolstoy's analysis of these statistics does much to revise our understanding of the war on the Eastern Front, as he demonstrates that these high Russian military casualties were largely due to the Soviets' crude methods of waging war. "Penal battalions" composed of "enemies of the people" (i.e., inmates of prisons and camps, and luckless peasants, including women and children) were hurled in waves against German defensive positions. Frequently unarmed and at times deprived of camouflaged uniforms to better draw enemy fire, they were often used to clear minefields. With NKVD machine-gunners poised behind them, they were forced across minefields until a path was cleared. The wounded were killed off by the NKVD. General Ratov, chief of the Soviet Military Mission to Britain, actually declined an offer of British mine-detectors, remarking that "in the Soviet Union we use people." SMERSH (from the initials "Death to Spies"), the NKVD's special murder arm made famous by Ian Fleming in his James Bond thrillers, was created in 1942 as an additional guard on Soviet front-line troops. The NKVD placed large heavily-armed formations at the rear of Soviet units to discourage withdrawals and to pick off "stragglers" and "cowards." In a number of instances, NKVD units fought pitched battles with Red Army detachments trying to retreat in the face of superior enemy forces. Stalin continued to purge his armed forces even as the Axis advanced. It is likely that hundreds of thousands of Russians were killed in such actions.

As for the POWs who died in German captivity, Tolstoy reminds the reader that the Soviet government refused to sign the

Geneva Convention on Prisoners of War, refused to cooperate with the International Red Cross (the Nazis allowed the Red Cross to visit concentration camps), and rebuffed German feelers forwarded through neutrals concerning compliance with the Hague Convention. A 1941 directive ordered Red Army men to commit suicide instead of surrender and Soviet law regarded Russian POWs as traitors. Besides their own "penal battalions," the Russians occasionally used POWs to clear minefields.

German attitudes toward the Russians were further colored by evidence of NKVD massacres encountered at such places as L'Vov, Vinnitsa, and Katyn. They found not just piles of corpses, but apparently mass-produced torture instruments, including devices for squeezing the skull, another for the testicles, and tools used to skin prisoners alive. Ice picks, broken bottles, or whatever else was handy or preferred were also used. Tolstoy observes that "Soviet cruelty far outstripped that of National Socialism. . . . Torture in the USSR was (and is) employed on a mass scale as an important punitive means of overawing a resentful population." He goes on to explain that these ghastly scenes of state-sanctioned depravity "confirmed the German view that Bolshevik Russia was irredeemably savage and backward." Considering how civilians and POWs were treated by the Communists, the Germans felt no obligation to show much consideration for Russian POWs. According to the author, there was a purpose behind all of this cruelty:

> Stalin went out of his way to invite Nazi ill-treatment and later extermination of Russian prisoners-of-war. . . . It is quite clear, therefore, that the deaths of over three million Russians in German custody was a piece of deliberate Soviet policy, the aim of which was to cause the liquidation of men regarded automatically as political traitors, whilst directing the anger of the Soviet people against the perpetrators of the crime. . . . It should not be forgotten, either, that Soviet cruelty greatly prolonged the conflict, costing all belligerent nations millions of lives. . . . This evidence of how the Soviets treated their own people, coupled with the harsh treatment they visited on prisoners-of-war, was the major cause of Germany's obstinate determination to fight on to the end, long after it had become clear her cause was doomed.

Having accounted for the 7½ million military casualties, Tolstoy states that four million Russian civilians were killed by the Germans (although this includes those involved in anti-Partisan operations, military sieges of such cities as Leningrad, and 750,000 Jews). This leaves 18-20 million additional Russians killed in the course of Stalin's "secret war" against his own subjects.

In his study Tolstoy sheds additional light on the British role in the immediate post-war forced repatriation of Russian POWs and

refugees back to the USSR, a topic dealt with at length in his earlier book, *The Secret Betrayal.** Nikolai Krasnov, one of the few "returnees" who survived ten years in the GULAG and was then allowed to leave Russia in 1955, is quoted as having been told by Beria's deputy Vsevolod Merkulov:

> But the fact that you [and the other Cossacks] trusted the English—that was real stupidity! Now they are history's shopkeepers! They will cheerfully sell anything or anyone and never bat an eyelid. Their politics are those of the prostitute. Their Foreign Office is a brothel. . . . They trade in foreigners' lives and in their own conscience.

In Chapter 16, "Western Attitudes," Tolstoy attempts to reach an understanding of why so many in the West, especially "intellectuals," avidly supported the Soviet Union. He notes that there has long been a fascination with totalitarian solutions among the Left and that Soviet Marxism appealed to certain intellectuals' desire to rule society. Simple greed and envy are other factors. Tolstoy refutes the oft-made claim that the excesses of Communism must be weighed against the need to fight Fascism: "As Communism formed the prior totalitarian threat, this argument is surely more exculpatory of Fascism and Nazism than the reverse."**

Stalin's Secret War successfully counters such "standard" treatments of this period as Harrison Salisbury's *The Unknown War* and Alexander Werth's *Russia At War, 1941-1945*. It deserves to be considered a standard reference work about Stalin and his role in World War II.

---

* Reviewed by this writer in *Journal of Historical Review* Vol. 1 No. 4 (Winter 1980), pp. 371-76.

** In his book *An End to Silence* (Norton, 1982), Stephen Cohen points out that "judged only by the number of victims, and leaving aside important differences between the two regimes, Stalinism created a holocaust greater than Hitler's." Writing in the *New Republic* of 26 May 1982 (an article headlined on the cover as "Why Stalin Was Even Worse Than Hitler"), Richard Grenier further reflects this most interesting phenomenon of recent years—the semi-revision even among traditionalist liberals of attitudes toward Hitler, vis-a-vis Stalin:

> It is no doubt a by-product of our having fought a great war against Nazi Germany, and not against the Soviet Union, that general notions of the Nazi's system of government, history, and unspeakable crimes have entered into American folklore and popular parlance, while those of the Soviet Union have not. . . . At the war's close thousands of journalists and photographers, both civilian and military, climbed all over Nazi death camps, saw the dead and dying. As a result, Hitler's lieutenants—Himmler, Goering, Goebbels—are still household names in America. Almost everyone knows of Auschwitz, Dachau, Buchenwald, Treblinka. Fascism is still popularly taken to have no rival in

The issue of American involvement in the forced repatriation of Russians at the end of World War II, touched upon by Tolstoy in *Stalin's Secret War*, is the topic of Mark Elliott's recent study *Pawns of Yalta*. It is an expansion of the author's 1974 University of Kentucky Ph.D. dissertation, and takes into consideration additional material declassified in the 1970s and now available at the National Archives in Washington—such as the "Operation Keelhaul" papers.

When the war in Europe ended, there were several million POWs and refugees in the Western occupational zones. Among them were "Soviet citizens" whom the United States and Britain had pledged at the February 1945 Yalta conference to return to Soviet authorities. These included Red Army POWs, some of the estimated five to six million civilians who had been press-ganged by agents of Hitler's Plenipotentiary-General for Labor Mobilization Fritz Sauckel to work as laborers in the Reich's factories and farms, thousands of pre-war emigrés who had fled Russia during the turbulent years 1917-1922, as well as a portion of the one million Soviet soldiers who served in the Wehrmacht during the war.

It is still a surprise to many in the West when they learn that by 1944-45, up to 40% of some "German" formations, and 10 to 15% of all units, were composed of *Osttruppen* (ex- Red Army men). In addition to the *Hilfswillige* scattered throughout the German armed forces, three divisions composed of Soviet racial minorities fought on the Eastern Front with the Axis: the Cossack Cavalry Division, the Turkish Division (made up of Moslems from Soviet Central Asia), and the Ukrainian Waffen SS Division "Galicia." And by November 1944, the first division of the proposed Russian Liberation Army, commanded by former Red Army General Andrei Vlasov, became operational. It did engage in some fighting against the Red Army in 1945, and from 6-8 May helped the Czechs liberate Prague from the Germans, before surrendering to the U.S. Third Army on 10 May. Elliott points out that these one million ex- Red Army soldiers who performed

political evil, which is not without irony since the Fascist states, in defense of private property and their own form of mixed economy, copied most of their techniques of government slavishly from the Bolshevik model.

But when it comes to the Soviet Union, how many Americans have heard of the assassination of Sergei Kirov? How many know the name of the dread Yezhov, onetime grand master of the NKVD, who sent many more people to their deaths than Himmler, and in less time? This with the additional idiosyncrasy that, whereas Himmler, quite hideously, was murdering mostly people he considered subhuman or members of a slave race, Yezhov, perversely as well as hideously, was killing the very "workers and peasants" in whose name Stalin ruled. . . . Much honor is paid to Solzhenitsyn, but how many remember the names of the Gulag's great camps . . . where many more millions died than in the Nazis' camps?

duties in German uniform "amounted to the largest military defection in history."

Both the U.S. and Britain were signatories to the 1929 Geneva Convention dealing with the treatment of Prisoners of War. This obligated parties to treat POWs "on the basis of the uniforms worn at the time of capture." While the war continued, the U.S. complied with this bilateral agreement, not wishing to give the Germans cause to mistreat American POWs of German, Italian, or Japanese descent. After VE-Day, when there was no longer danger of Nazi reprisal, the U.S. (and Britain) quickly set about repatriating German POWs on the basis of their nationality, in flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention. A secret protocol of the Yalta agreement also provided for the forced return of Russian ex- concentration camp inmates and others who had managed to escape from Stalin's slaughter house, thus obliterating, in the words of the author, "all trace of the proud Western tradition of political asylum."

The British went a step further by handing over to the NKVD a number of former White Russian officers, some of whom had fought the Bolsheviks during the Second World War. All of them had been living outside of Russia since the end of the Russian Civil War and carried foreign passports or League of Nations stateless persons I.D.s. Alexander Solzhenitsyn has characterized this as "an act of double dealing consistent with the spirit of traditional English diplomacy."

American servicemen, led by wartime pro-Soviet propaganda to believe that Stalin was kindly "Uncle Joe" overseeing a noble human experiment in the USSR, were shocked at how most Russians in their charge reacted to the news that they were going to be repatriated to their Soviet homeland. This is illustrated by what took place at Dachau on 17 June 1946, after American authorities informed 400 Soviet refugees that they were going to be sent back to Russia:

> The scene inside was one of human carnage. The crazed men were attempting to take their own lives by any means. Guards cut down some trying to hang themselves from the rafters; two others disembowled themselves; another man forced his head through a window and ran his throat over the glass fragments; others begged to be shot. Robert Murphy reported that "tear gas forced them out of the building into the snow where those who had cut and stabbed themselves fell exhausted and bleeding in the snow." Thirty-one men tried to take their own lives. Eleven succeeded: nine by hanging and two from knife wounds. Camp authorities managed to entrain the remaining 368. Despite the presence of American guards and a Soviet liaison officer, six of these escaped en route to the Soviet occupation zone. More and more the repatriation of unwilling persons was coming to disturb battle-hardened troops.

The following month similar events took place at the Plattling camp in Bavaria. These were described by an eye-witness, U.S. Army translator William Sloane Coffin, Jr.:

> Despite the fact that there were three GIs to every returning Russian, I saw several men commit suicide. Two rammed their heads through windows sawing their necks on the broken glass until they cut their jugular veins. Another took his leather bootstraps, tied a loop to the top of his triple-decker bunk, put his head through the noose and did a back flip over the edge which broke his neck. . . . The memory is so painful that it's almost impossible for me to write about it. My part in the Plattling operation left me a burden of guilt I am sure to carry the rest of my life.

Through suicide, several thousand Russians managed to escape the horrors that awaited returnees in the East.

Like Tolstoy, Elliott reviews the Stalinist attitude toward Russians who had spent time outside Soviet control during the course of the war. Soviet Decree #270 of 1942 labeled as deserters Red Army troopers who surrendered to the enemy. Forced laborers were also considered to be traitors. Relatives of POWs and dragooned workers were likewise treated as if they had personally committed acts of treason. Stalin's government, as noted above, rejected attempts by the Germans and the International Red Cross to obtain Soviet compliance with the Hague Convention.

After the 1939-40 Winter War with Finland, returned Soviet POWs were either shot or sent to slave labor camps in the Far North or Siberia. This is also how the victims of forced repatriation were dealt with. According to Elliott, of the approximately 2,500,000 Russians repatriated by the Western Allies, some 300,000 were executed by the NKVD soon after their delivery to Soviet authorities. With a few exceptions, the rest were condemned to the lingering doom of 10 to 25 year sentences in labor camps, from which ordeal few survived. Elliott also points out that the USSR never released 1.5 to 2 million German POWs, 200,000 to 300,000 Japanese POWs, and did not repatriate those few ex-Axis soldiers who did manage to survive the rigors of GULAG until 1956.

Elliott argues that the U.S. participated in this sordid business out of concern for the safety of 24,000 American servicemen who were in Soviet-controlled territory at the end of the war. However, he admits that U.S. cooperation with Soviet authorities was not reciprocated. And even after the last G.I. returned in July 1945, the U.S. *continued* the forced repatriation of luckless Russian POWs, refugees, and Vlasovites. (The last documented cases of forced repatriation took place in May and June 1947, Operations "Keelhaul" and "Eastwind"; Allied Forces Head-

quarters obtained Soviet assurances that they would accept corpses if the repatriation operation led to fatalities.)

Not everyone in higher circles approved of the repatriation policy; the author reveals instances where individual military officers and civilian government officials disobeyed or opposed the Yalta provisions. In June 1945, General Patton simply let 5000 Russian POWs go, and other commanders permitted lightly-guarded Russians to slip away. Secretary of War Henry Stimson was a vigorous opponent of forced repatriation, as were Acting Secretary of State Joseph Grew and Attorney General Francis Biddle, who felt that "Even if these men should be technically traitors to their own government, I think the time-honored rule of asylum should be applied." In the opinion of R.W. Flournoy, the State Department's legal advisor, "nothing in the [Geneva] Convention either requires or justifies this Government in sending the unfortunate Soviet nationals in question to Russia, where they will almost certainly be liquidated."

This book serves as a companion volume to Count Tolstoy's *The Secret Betrayal*, which deals largely with the British role in forced repatriation. It is a grim chapter of our recent history—and one totally ignored in contemporary textbooks and most treatments of the Second World War and its aftermath.

Book Reviews

DAS FUEHRERHAUPTQUARTIER 1939-1945 [THE FUEHRER HEADQUARTERS 1939-1945] compiled and edited by Gerhard Buck. Leoni am Starnberger See [D-8137]: Druffel Verlag, 1983, 176pp, DM 36.00, ISBN 3-8061-0830-7.

DIE GROSSE ZEIT DES DEUTSCHEN FILMS 1933-1945 [THE GREAT AGE OF GERMAN FILMS 1933-1945] edited by Michele Sakkara. Leoni am Starnberger See [D-8137]: Druffel Verlag, 1980, 184pp, DM 36.00, ISBN 3-8061-1002-6.

These are two "Contemporary History in Pictures" volumes which, besides being beautifully produced and presenting many photographs rarely seen (at least in America), are refreshingly devoid textually of anti-Nazi polemics or innuendo. They are published by Germany's foremost revisionist publishing house, Druffel, which was founded in 1952 and directed for many years by Helmut Suendermann, formerly the Reich's Deputy Press Chief under Otto Dietrich. Unlike his erstwhile boss, Suendermann was immune to the pervasive post-1945 character disease known as "Creeping *Zeitgeist*" and did not go the turncoat route; rather he set on a course of writing and publishing books dealing with the war and the Hitler era which approached things straightforwardly and honestly, with none of the boring snivel-cringe-deplore-and-apologize tone (always done with one eye cocked on the watchful victors) which may nearly universally be found in books coming out of postwar Germany. Since Suendermann's death in 1972, Druffel has been ably run by his son-in-law, Dr. Gert Sudholt, who has kept up the tradition which makes the house (along with the Grabert Verlag of Tuebingen) a lonely voice of sanity and restraint in the asylum known as West German publishing. These two picture books represent the tradition well and, given the current vogue for such eye-pleasing and easily-read productions, it may be hoped with some justification that their circulation, particularly among the young in West Germany, will be considerable.

Das Fuehrerhauptquartier 1939-1945 is a guided tour through the various operational headquarters used by Hitler during his campaigns. The first such "FHQ" was really his special train *Amerika* which took him to his Polish front field headquarters at Bad Polzin; the last was the bunker beneath the shattered Reich Chancellory in Berlin. In between were seven different camouflaged, fortified, heavily-guarded complexes of bunkers and

houses running through Europe from West to East. In or in transit to these austere settings, Hitler spent the last five years of his life, aside from occasional side trips and sojourns in Berlin, Berchtesgaden, or Munich. It was doubtless a strange existence, but then this was a strange man playing a strange, quite unique role. As "First Soldier of the Reich" Hitler had vowed on 1 September 1939 not to take off his military tunic until victory had been won—failing victory he would die in the struggle. He kept this vow. The *denouement* on 30 April 1945 was certainly easy for him; he was not afraid of death in a personal sense (his only concern was that it would cut short his work), and spoke often during the war about the peaceful "release" death would bring him. What was surely difficult for Hitler was not dying for his cause but living for it in the role of a *Feldherr* occupied almost exclusively with the conduct of a long, run-amok war that he didn't want and hadn't planned for. With most everything else shunted aside from his personal consideration—the great building plans, the artistic and cultural renaissance, the ongoing *Gleichschaltung*-in all realms (it was hardly completed in the '30s)—Hitler, the artistic personality above all, must have felt like an artist forbidden to play his instrument. Left to him instead were the cacaphonous instruments of war, including generals, which he had not intended to play upon for very long in his late life; there were other things that needed doing, completing. But events interfered: first the failure to gain in lightning fashion the Eastern empire that he felt was absolutely necessary to Germany's, and Europe's, future, and then the struggle merely to keep the pressing enemy coalition out and survive. The *Feldherr* could not retire.

This book records in pictures the *world*—it really was a separate world unto itself—Hitler lived in during the war, the places where the course of the struggle from the German side was decided. We see what these places looked like—their surroundings, their insides, their occupants (many of the photographs show the actual work of the headquarters being conducted). There is *Felsennest* (Mountain Nest) in Germany near the Belgian border, from where the May 1940 invasion of the West was directed; *Wolfschlucht* (Wolf's Gorge) at Bruly-de-Pesche in Belgium, command-post for the defeat of France; *Tannenburg* (Pine Mountain) in the depths of the Black Forest, where in July 1940 the great gains were reviewed, and from which Hitler made nostalgic visits to his old World War I battlefields; *Fruehlingssturm* (Spring Storm), a length of train track near a tunnel at Moenichkirchen in Austria, where the interventions in Greece and Yugoslavia were overseen; *Wolfschanze* (Wolf's Lair) near Rastenburg in East Prussia, the most famous and oft-used (1941-1944) of the headquarters, a forest-swamp from where the great-

est campaign of all—against Russia—was directed, and from which was witnessed the irrevocable turning of the war; *Wehrwolf* near Vinnytsa in the Ukraine, used in 1942-43 to direct the Southern Russian front; *Wolfschlucht 'II'* at Martival in France, constructed in 1943-44 for the expected Western invasion, used by Hitler only once in June 1944; *Adlerhorst* (Eagle's Nest) in the village of Wiesental (!) near Bad Nauheim, built in 1939-40 but used for the first and last time during the December 1944 Ardennes offensive. Not slighted either are the Reich Chancellory itself (both the regular offices and the later underground bunker) and Berchtesgaden. The book is arranged in the general chronological order in which the headquarters were used; Gerhard Buck's economical but informative text details the history of and most important events occurring at each place. Captions scrupulously identify places and persons in the photos. An appendix reproduces examples of orders relating to headquarters logistics and travel. As a documentary look at world-historic places and people, this book is fascinating. (It is one thing to read about the "oppressive, closed-in" atmosphere of *Wolfschanze*; it is another to *see* it. The absolutely massive concrete bunkers there, towering up incongruously within the towering pine groves, contribute an impression of unreality.) Perused in conjunction with such books as David Irving's *Hitler's War*, Walter Warlimont's *Inside Hitler's Headquarters*, Felix Gilbert's *Hitler Directs His War*, or the *Kriegstagebuch des OKW*, it is invaluable for an appreciation of the historical *sense* as well as the historical record of those places where decisions were made which shaped our world—though not the way the decision-makers intended.

A final note: Most of the headquarters complexes still stand, in varying conditions of ruin and overgrowth, and are open to any who wish to wander around them. At *Wolfschlucht*, for example, one can roam in Hitler's bunker bedroom, or stand on the same spot where he stomped with joy upon learning of France's capitulation. The final section of the book is devoted to photos of the sites as they are today. One picture may be worth a thousand words, but one visit must be worth a hundred thousand pictures. Short of a visit the 160 photos in *Das Fuehrerhauptquartier 1939-1945* are the next best thing.

* * * * *

By the very years given in its title, *Die grosse Zeit des deutschen Films 1933-1945* proclaims its defiance of the conventional "wisdom." This wisdom holds that the "great age" of German films—as of all things artistic and cultural in Germany—

was the *Weimar* age; after that things got dark, all true creativity was stifled, and evil came to the fore. Most all the great and innovative film artists went into foreign exile (cf. Fritz Lang), and Germany was left with hacks who could turn out only boring banalities made even more banal by constant mandatory infusions of heavy-handed National Socialist propaganda. True, Leni Riefenstahl and a couple others may have done some great work, but the greatness was of a peculiar "demonic" nature. All-in-all, film production in the Third Reich not only contributed little or zero to the historical development of filmic artistry, it was actually a blot on that development, just as National Socialism itself was a blot on Western civilizational progress.

What does it take to bury such myths? *Time*, for one thing. (One would do well never to undervalue "mere" time as a corrective healing agent.) Though the "consensus" picture outlined above still has a powerful hold, especially as used to indoctrinate lay or only semi-specialized audiences, recent years have in fact seen its steady erosion in favor of a more balanced—even revisionist—view, this accomplished by film historians and filmmakers themselves. Already in 1969 David Stewart Hull in *Film in the Third Reich* could not, even while dutifully inserting some of the standard disclaimers and clichés, hide his admiration for much of what he was describing. Andrew Sarris in the 1970s could praise Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* even to the point of remarking that one might well, were a viewing of *Triumph* his only key, wonder what all this fuss about Hitler's Germany being so bad was about. Francis Ford Coppola could publicly proclaim his admiration for Riefenstahl—even to the point of organizing a festival retrospective for her. The "consensus" *is* breaking down, albeit slowly. And it involves more than merely "revising Riefenstahl"—for, it is being discovered, there is much, much more to Third Reich filmography than merely her great work. *Die grosse Zeit des deutschen Films* shows just how much.

The book contains 138 pictures and is divided into three chapters: "Great Directors," "Great Players," and "Great Films," descriptive biographies or filmographies accompanying the selection of pictures in each. A short but meaty historical and critical essay introduces the book, justifying in delightfully bold fashion why 1933-45 must be considered the "great age"; this essay alone is almost (not quite) worth the price of the book. (The pictures alone *are* worth the price; pictures plus text make it a bargain.) Preceding all is a brief foreword explaining the purpose and scope of the work. The scope is considerable—in the variety of films, personages, themes, and styles presented—but it is by no means exhaustive nor does it try to be. It is not a *history* of the German cinema in these years, but a selective display of high-

lights from that cinema: 10 directors, 42 star players, and 42 films are offered in the respective chapters. As in any such arbitrary selective production, one might quarrel here and there with what has been omitted. But choosing a comparative handful from the hundreds of films made during the National Socialist era is not easy, and editor Michele Sakkara has succeeded remarkably well in culling those films which demonstrate the versatility and high artistic quality of the German cinema of those years. All the great ones are here. (This with one *caveat*: here the emphasis is on feature entertainment films and dramatic actors and actresses, not documentaries. Indeed only one documentary, Riefenstahl's *Olympia*, is mentioned at any length. The great party, state, and military-campaign documentaries, which indeed make up a very significant part of the National Socialist film heritage, are left out. They would deserve a similar book of their own.)

"Feature entertainment films" in the Third Reich were not necessarily devoid of a message—although, as in Hollywood, the vast majority were strictly entertainment, even "fluff." Many of the greatest films—and that includes most of those featured in this book—did have something to say. Hitler, Goebbels, and the latter's brilliant *Reichsfilmintendant*, Fritz Hippler, were all acutely aware of the power of film as a propaganda medium. They were also aware that such use of film could be overdone, and that often people wanted *just* to be entertained. (When it came time to celebrate the state-run UFA film studio's 20th anniversary in 1943, Goebbels instructed that the giant film made to mark the occasion be absolutely devoid of any political content. The result was the color comedy-fantasy epic *Münchhausen* starring Hans Albers, one of the most beloved films ever to come out of Western Europe—still widely shown today.) Perhaps because of the restriction of "message" films to a relative few, extraordinary care was taken in them that the message be delivered powerfully and effectively. (This is doubtless the prime reason for the virtual blackout on these films today, in both Europe and America; *Münchhausen* may be "safe" fare, but *Hitlerjunge Quex* is definitely *not*.) A "message" was not necessarily a blaring, loudspeaker-style state or party political announcement. It could be a quiet, eloquent statement on a philosophical or social issue, like the plea for understanding of the essential humanity of euthanasia for the mortally ill given in *Ich Klage An*. ("Dear Abby" might not appreciate the fact that her own position on this social issue is exactly the same as that in this "Nazi" film.) Or the value of the countryside over corruptive city life, in *Die Goldene Stadt*. Politics, of course, had its part to play. *Historical*-political themes were a favorite, especially during the war years:

British mendacity in *Ohm Krueger* and *Titanic*; German greatness in *Der Grosse Koenig, Bismark, Karl Peters, Kolberg*. (It is most interesting that there were no World War II German dramatic films dealing with grand political-historical figures of the *contemporary* day. Hitler, quite in contrast to Stalin—and Roosevelt—never allowed an actor to portray him on the screen. Nor were allowed any portrayals of the nation's great antagonists—again quite a contrast. Hollywood produced *The Hitler Gang* but UFA produced no *Der Roosevelt Bande*. In a way it's too bad.) The Jewish question was touched on in *Jud Suess, Die Rothschilds*, and the strikingly effective documentary *Der Ewige Jude*, called by some the "most evil film ever made." (Ah, but perhaps it was in the nature of things.) These three, incidentally, were the *only* films made in National Socialist Germany that could be described as at all anti-Jewish. It is instructive to compare this fact with the fact of the *dozens upon dozens* of virulently, obscenely anti-*German* films that came out of Jewish Hollywood in 1935-45—and since.

What emerges from this book is the sense of a (deliberately) "lost" world being recaptured for the memory. There was a whole *film culture* in Germany of great intelligence, industry, technical achievement and devotion to art, which has unconscionably been largely ignored; it was every bit as exciting and important to the development of this young art as what was happening at the same time in Hollywood's own "great age"—or, for a better comparison, Soviet Russia's. (The Soviets and the Germans were making the best films in the world back then.) The German films do survive, even if they haven't been talked about, or shown, much.* It is a great pity that thus far Americans and others have not, for the most part, been afforded the opportunity to appreciate it all: the superb acting of Ferdinand Marian, Werner Krauss, Hans Albers, Heinrich George, Otto Gebuehr, Kristina Soederbaum, Zarah Leander, Marian Hoppe; the thrilling musical scores of Herbert Windt, George Haentzchel, Merc Roland; the meticulous direction of Hans Steinhoff, Veit Harlan, G.W. Pabst, Carl Ritter; so much and so many more. Their names light up the pantheon of film history as they lit up the screen. This book is a fitting and long-needed tribute to their artistry. Those fortunate enough to witness that artistry will find in it all the confirmation needed of the truth contained in the title of *Die grosse Zeit des deutschen Films 1933-1945*.

—*Keith Stimely*

* The established source in America for many of these films on videocassette is International Historic Films, P.O. Box 29035, Chicago, IL 60629—catalog sent on request. *The JHR* cannot, of course, officially vouchsafe the reliability of any other firm; due caution in all mail-order dealings is advised.

THE PRIORITY OF N.C. PAULESCU IN THE DISCOVERY OF INSULIN by Ion Pavel. Bucharest: Academy of the Socialist Republic of Romania, 1976, 251pp, 13.50 Lei.

No award is more highly regarded around the world than the Nobel Prize. It is the most coveted recognition of exceptional achievement in the major fields of human endeavor. Despite its prestige, the Prize is not an infallible indication of merit. Literary giants such as Leo Tolstoi, Theodore Dreiser and Anton Chekhov were passed over in favor of unquestionably less-deserving writers. The Peace Prize award to Henry Kissinger (with Le Duc Tho) in 1973 and to Menachem Begin (with Anwar Sadat) in 1978 provoked intense worldwide controversy.

In 1923, the Nobel Prize for Medicine was awarded jointly to Sir Frederick G. Banting, a Canadian, and John J.R. Macleod, a Scotsman, for the discovery of insulin, one of the greatest medical advances of modern times.

Insulin is a hormone produced by cells in the pancreas that regulate sugar production in the human body. The discovery of insulin has saved countless victims of diabetes from death, allowing them to lead practically normal lives. Largely because of the 1923 Nobel award, standard reference works credit Banting and his Toronto co-workers, Macleod and Charles H. Best, with this epochal medical breakthrough.

However, a substantial body of persuasive evidence indicates that the Nobel Committee made a major error in 1923, and that the award should rightfully have gone to an almost forgotten Romanian physiologist, Nicolai Paulescu. The only book available in English that makes the case for Paulescu is this passionately argued but poorly organized volume published in 1976. The work was put together by Ion Pavel, an elderly Bucharest scholar who has championed Paulescu's case for years in various journals and at international scientific conferences. Unfortunately, Pavel's often cumbersome and opaque writing style, poor translations, and the book's confusing organization are unworthy of Paulescu and his pioneering work. In spite of this it is an extremely valuable source in the history of twentieth century scientific breakthroughs.

Nicolai Constantin Paulescu was born in Bucharest in 1869. He received his medical education in Paris, where his extraordinary devotion and skills as a researcher won him special acclaim. During his stay in France, he proved himself a careful and critical observer.

In 1900 Paulescu returned to his beloved Romanian homeland, and during the next decade became internationally recognized as an experimental physiologist of exceptional ability. For thirty

years he conducted extensive research at the University of Bucharest. In his lifetime he contributed almost 90 scholarly papers to numerous European scientific journals. In 1903 he began publication of the monumental 4-volume *Traite de Medecine*, which he wrote with the late Paris professor Dr. Etienne Lancereaux. Paulescu authored the massive 3-volume *Traite de Physiologie Medicale* (2110 pages), published in 1919-1921.

Nicolai Paulescu was not merely an outstanding scientist. He was a remarkably decent man whose generosity and patience earned him the love of his devoted students. And he was an ardent patriot who loved his nation with characteristic Romanian fervor.

Paulescu's most important achievement, of course, was his successful isolation of the pancreas hormone that regulates the blood sugar level. He began work in this field in 1916, but the First World War interrupted his investigation. In 1921 he announced the discovery of the hormone extract which he called "pancreine," now known universally as insulin.

Naturally, Paulescu was shocked by the Nobel Committee's 1923 decision. He protested, but without success. As a matter of policy, the Committee refuses to reconsider awards once made. Shortly before his death from cancer in 1931, Paulescu recorded his bitter disappointment in these lines:

> Formerly I believed and maintained that a scientist can work in perfect safety, convinced as I was that the date of his publications protected him against any injustice. Unfortunately, I am obliged to admit now that I was utterly mistaken in this regard.
>
> I am not dominated by pride and I struggle against this odious vice. Indeed, on publishing my discovery I never for one moment thought of publicity, which could have affected my modesty that I consider one of the first qualities of a scientist. But I certainly cannot accept another, more odious defect, that of the theft of someone else's scientific property.

Paulescu's passing was an occasion of national mourning. Romanians turned out in great numbers to pay their last respects to a brilliant and devoted son who had brought great honor to his nation.

Paulescu announced his discovery of "pancreine" (insulin) in several scientific papers published between April and August 1921. The most comprehensive of these, and the one that best documented his claim as the pioneer discoverer of insulin, was received for publication by the widely respected *Archives Internationales de Physiologie* of Liege and Paris on 22 June 1921, and appeared in the issue of 31 August 1921. In it, Paulescu recorded his success in isolating the antidiabetic hormone of the pancreas and in using it to lower the blood sugar levels in both diabetic and

normal dogs. The paper by Banting and Best that announced their own "discovery" of insulin was first read on 31 December 1921 and appeared in the February 1922 issue of the Toronto *Journal of Laboratory and Clinical Medicine.*

Just about the only thing the two papers have in common is their announcement of the same "discovery" of an antidiabetic hormone extract. The Paulescu article not only appeared five months earlier than the Canadian paper, but was significantly more comprehensive and scholarly. That is not at all surprising in light of the well-documented immaturity and inexperience of Banting and Best.

If Paulescu was the real discoverer of insulin, how was it that the Nobel Committee decided to credit Banting and Macleod with the achievement? A major reason was the fact that although Paulescu was the first to successfully isolate insulin and use it to treat diabetes in dogs, Banting, Best, and Macleod were the first to use it on humans. Furthermore, an associate of their's, J.B. Collip, prepared a purer insulin from the extract and began producing it on a large scale, thus making it available to the public. Not surprisingly, the North American and European press enthusiastically hailed the Toronto team as the discoverers of insulin.

Another important factor was the Nobel Committee's acceptance of an inexcusably erroneous description of Paulescu's work by Banting and Best in their paper published in February 1922. Their article mentions Paulescu's earlier research, but falsely reports that the Romanian physiologist's injections of pancreas hormone extract into dogs had produced *no* effects. The crucial, oddly-worded passage read: "He [Paulescu] states that injections into peripheral veins produce no effect and his experiments show that second injections do not produce such marked effect as the first." In reaching its decision on the award for the discovery of insulin, the Nobel Committee obviously failed to critically compare the claims of Banting, Best and Macleod against Paulescu's papers.

Years later, Charles Best apologized for the crucial misrepresentation. "I regret very much that there was an error in our translation of Professor Paulescu's article," he wrote in a letter of 15 October 1969 to Ion Pavel. "I cannot recollect, after this length of time, exactly what happened. . . . I do not remember whether we relied on our own poor French or whether we had a translation made. In any case I would like to state how sorry I am for this unfortunate error and I trust that your efforts to honour Professor Paulescu will be rewarded with great success."

Rolf Luft, president of the International Diabetes Foundation and chairman of the Nobel Committee for Physiology and Medi-

cine, wrote in a 1971 article, "Who Discovered Insulin?": "One fact remains, namely that the earlier discovery made by Paulescu was misinterpreted by Banting and Best for reasons which we cannot know anything about today. . . . In my opinion, the [Nobel] prize should—without any doubt—have been shared between Paulescu, Banting and Best . . ." Prof. Eric Martin of Geneva noted in 1971 in a Swiss medical journal: "Thus, probably due to their poor knowledge of French, the merit of the Romanian scholar is reduced to nought."

Actually, there are grounds for believing that the misrepresentation by Banting and Best was not merely a case of negligent translation, but was in fact deliberate.

Several prominent scholars have condemned the Nobel Committee's injustice against Paulescu. Nobel Institute Director and 1948 Nobel Chemistry Prize winner, Prof. Arne Tiselius, stated in a December 1969 letter: "In my opinion, Paulescu was equally worthy of the award. . . . Unfortunately, there is no mechanism whereby the Nobel Committee could do anything now in this or similar cases. Personally, I can only hope that in an eventual celebration of the 50th anniversary of the discovery of insulin, due regard is paid to the pioneer work of Paulescu."

Prof. Ian Murray, an internationally regarded physiologist, was particularly active in working to correct the historical wrong against Paulescu. Murray was eminently qualified to speak authoritatively on this issue. He was a professor of physiology at the Anderson College of Medicine in Glasgow, Scotland, the head of the department of Metabolic Diseases at a leading Glasgow hospital, vice-president of the British Association of Diabetes, and a founding member of the International Diabetic Federation.

In an article for a 1971 issue of the *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences*, "Paulescu and the Isolation of Insulin," Murray wrote:

> Insufficient recognition has been given to Paulescu, the distinguished Romanian scientist, who at the time when the Toronto team were commencing their research had already succeeded in extracting the antidiabetic hormone of the pancreas and proving its efficacy in reducing the hyperglycaemia in diabetic dogs.
>
> Banting and Best are commonly believed to have been the first to have succeeded in isolating insulin. They have been hailed as its "discoverers." Their work, however, may more accurately be construed as confirmation of Paulescu's findings.
>
> When all the circumstances are reviewed, it does appear ironical that Paulescu with all his experience might be in danger of oblivion, while the young and inexperienced Banting is remembered as if he alone had been responsible for insulin.

The Nobel Committee may never correct its 1923 error. But the truth about the discovery of insulin cannot be suppressed for all time. Justice and honor mandate the recognition, however belated, of a forgotten medical pioneer, Nicolai Paulescu, the discoverer of insulin.

—*Mark Weber*

The Torture of Julius Streicher

A DOCUMENTARY EXPOSÉ

"This is Purim Fest 1946!" was Julius Streicher's apt comment before he was sucked down into death via a gallows trap-door in the Nuremberg Prison gymnasium on 16 October 1946. He was the seventh of ten International Military Tribunal defendants hanged that day in fulfillment of the sentences imposed. (Hermann Goering had cheated the hangman the night before with a cyanide capsule, a final gesture of contempt.) It was certainly a travesty that *any* of the 22 original defendants should have been put on "trial" before, let alone condemned by, such a collection of raving Western idiots and cynical Soviet criminals as constituted the IMT. But the case of Julius Streicher, former National Socialist *Gauleiter* of Franconia, editor and publisher of *Der Stuermer*, was especially ludicrous. He was unique among the convicted defendants in that he was tried not for anything he was alleged to have done, or ordered, or acquiesced in, but for what he had *thought* and *written*. In his case the Allied prosecutors made few bones about it—there was no attempt to dress up the indictment by accusing him of actual participation in or even knowledge of any "crimes against peace" or "war crimes." (They knew that this would have been rather difficult, given that Streicher had held no official post since February 1940, and had been out of favor and devoid of official influence since long before that time.) He was charged under Counts One and Four of the Indictment: "common plan or conspiracy to wage aggressive war, " and "crimes against humanity." No real attempt was made to nail him on the first count, and he was acquitted. On the other count he was convicted and condemned to death. As Germany's world-famed Jew-baiter *numero uno*, Streicher was to be made an example of *on this point*—essentially on the point of being a vociferous anti-semite. The tribunal's final judgement was that

> . . . . Streicher's incitement of murder and extermination at the time when Jews in the East were being killed under the most horrible conditions clearly constitutes persecution on political and racial grounds in connection with war crimes as defined by the Charter, and constitutes a crime against humanity.

The attempts made during the proceedings to prove that Streicher has at least *known about* the alleged extermination program were not very successful, based as they were on the issue whether Streicher had read claims of extermination in foreign Jewish newspapers; Streicher did admit this—he was aware of *foreign allegations*. (It is instructive that the prosecution had to base its claim of Streicher's "knowing" on such a thing, rather than on anything coming to him from the Reich government itself, or from anywhere within the Reich.) In the event, the final judgement against Streicher was not on the question of such "knowledge" of murder but purely on the question of alleged *incitement* to murder, via his pre-war speeches and his writings throughout the years in *Der Stuermer*. Not Goering, not Ribbentrop, not Rosenberg, nor Sauckel, Frank, Jodl, Keitel—not *any* of the other convicted defendants* were put on trial for merely their dissemination of views on a social-political issue. They were all in the dock because of things they had allegedly *done* or been directly involved in which the IMT determined to have been violations of its interpretation, as codified in its charter, of "International Law." Streicher joined them in the dock and on the gallows because of what he *thought*, and because he *said* publicly what he thought. There was not even any real attempt to obscure this fact within legal mumbo-jumbo. Nor was the IMT concerned with the fact that Streicher's "incitement" happened to violate no law—not in Germany nor, for that matter, in any of the Allied countries. This was some trial.

But Streicher's case was unique in another way also. He was the only IMT defendant to have been systematically, physically tortured while under Allied custody awaiting trial. Some of the other defendants did have complaints about various aspects of their treatment since arrest (Hans Frank mentioned being beaten up once by American negroes), in particular the humiliating, pettily-harassing conditions of their cell-life—but none made a claim to having been treated as horrendously as Streicher described. These were after all the "Major War Criminals," the "first string" Nazis upon whom the spotlight of world attention was to glare at Nuremberg; claims of torture would have been most embarrassing to the Allies, who were bragging about how just and fair and legally high-minded they were behaving toward their captives. When Streicher brought up during the IMT proceedings his claim of having been tortured, it was clear that the prosecution was surprised and at something of a loss. The claim

*Hans Fritzsche, the National Socialist radio personality stuck into the Nuremberg proceedings as a poor man's substitute for Joseph Goebbels, who was a corpse, was like Streicher basically accused of "incitement" to crimes. He was acquitted.

was stricken from the official record; otherwise an investigation would have been required.

What Streicher had vainly tried to relate on the record were his experiences shortly after his arrest, before he had been brought to Mondorf in Luxembourg, the "holding center" for the IMT defendants before the trial began. His torture was not sanctioned by the IMT or, apparently, any high authorities. His reputation had preceded him: it was a simple case of low-level revenge and sadism.

Streicher and his wife were arrested on 22 May 1945 in the village of Weidring (Waldring), just southwest of Berchtesgaden. He was first taken to Berchtesgaden, then passed through Salzburg and Munich before winding up at Freising, northwest of Munich, where he stayed three days before being transferred to Wiesbaden. After one day there he was taken to Mondorf, where he remained until finally being taken to Nuremberg in late August.*

It was between Berchtesgaden and Wiesbaden, particularly in Freising, that Streicher was tortured in direct violation of the Geneva Convention. (At this time he was not even indicted or accused of a crime.) Historian Werner Maser devoted two pages to this in his 1977 book *Nuremberg: Tribunal der Sieger* (the 1979 American edition of which suffered a strange, toned-down metamorphosis in title: *Nuremberg: A Nation on Trial*). Maser's source, which he quoted chillingly in full, was a manuscript account by Streicher describing the most unspeakable tortures and degradations inflicted upon him by U.S. Army negroes and Jews. The manuscript was written for Streicher's lawyer, Dr. Hanns Marx, and is now in Maser's possession. Maser accepted the truth of this account, commenting that

> . . . . For two decades Streicher had reviled, slandered and insulted world Jewry, had offered them up to racial fanatics as vermin; so, eighteen months before his execution by hanging, he found himself with a personal account to square; the "holy wrath" of his victims led them to apply the Old Testament law of "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Streicher's biographer William P. Varga, in his 1981 book *The Number One Nazi Jew-Baiter* (actually a fairly serious work, despite the comic-book title) mentions the allegation of torture at Freising:

---

* It was at Mondorf that Streicher composed his autobiographical/political testament, a manuscript of some 15,000 words. It was published as "Das Politische Testament," edited and with a foreword by Jay. W. Baird, in *Vierteljahrshefte fuer Zeitgeschichte* (April 1978).

> [U.S. Army Intelligence Captain John] Dolibois later related that Streicher complained bitterly of his treatment at the hands of American soldiers before his transfer to Mondorf. Evidently his notoriety as a fanatic racial persecutor was known to the troops at Freising. Streicher claimed that he and his wife were forced by some black American soldiers to walk in public stripped of their clothes. These soldiers allegedly spat on them and extinguished cigarettes on their bare skin. At Mondorf, an unconfirmed report was circulated stating that some soldiers had taken photographs that showed Streicher dressed only in an open coat, with swollen testicles and a crown of thorns on his head with a sign draped over his neck with the words "Julius Streicher, King of the Jews."

However, Varga goes on to describe "most of Streicher's complaints" of such treatment as "extremely questionable"; they were "apparently fabricated." The only basis he presents for this skepticism is a letter written by Streicher at Mondorf in June 1945 to former *Stuermer* colleagues, in which are mentioned "only" his uncomfortable handcuffs, and his having been forced to stamp out cigarettes with bare feet. For biographer Varga, this constitutes evidence that Streicher "fabricated" other stories. He does not seem to have considered that in writing this particular letter, Streicher may have suffered under constraints as mundane as time or as special as censorship. His argument against Streicher's veracity here is rather obviously a grasp at the only straw—and a very thin one—available. Varga in 1981 was apparently unaware of the lengthy, detailed Streicher statement published by Maser in 1977. (Maser's book is not listed in his bibliography.) That Streicher made a point in this statement of mentioning who had treated him *well* in addition to who had treated him *badly*, delineating clearly between these types and their actions with details as to time, place, and names where he knew them, would seem to auger the truth of what it contains. The acceptance of the statement as a genuine, honest record by Werner Maser—a respected historian hardly partial to National Socialism, much less to the Julius Streicher variety—is unquestionably well-founded.

It is not the only piece of evidence extant. In the Fall of 1982 another document surfaced which sheds more light on the torture of Julius Streicher. It is a seven-page, handwritten statement given by Streicher at Mondorf to an American officer, who requested it after hearing Streicher's verbal complaints. In that officer's hands for 37 years, never published or cited, the document was sold at auction by the Charles Hamilton Autograph Gallery in New York City in October 1982, for the price of $1,200. The *Journal of Historical Review* was able to obtain a copy of this historically significant document. It is published on the following

pages for the first time, in English translation and followed by photographs of the handwritten original. Also reproduced is a letter from the officer to the auctioneer describing the circumstances under which he obtained the document.

A comparison of this document with that presented by Maser in his book shows the consistency in events described. Its publication at last adds to our knowledge of a particularly shameful postwar episode.

—*Keith Stimely*

Translation

On 22 May [1945] I was arrested in Waidring (Tirol) and was brought into the jail at Salzburg. There my hands were put into handcuffs by a Jewish police-officer.

On 23 May, I was brought to Freising, via Toelz and Munich. During the 200 Kilometer trip in considerable cold, I was only dressed with shirt and pants, since my jacket was not given to me. My hands were handcuffed.

In Freising I was put in a cell, where there was no possibility of sitting or lying down. The window was removed and the cell was cold. During my three days stay in there (23 May afternoon to 26 May afternoon) I was subjected to the following treatment:

1) After being stripped of my clothes, two Negroes tore my shirt into two pieces. Dressed only with my underpants, and barefoot, I spent three days in the cold room. During the night and during a few hours in daytime, I was handed an old military coat. It was taken away immediately, whenever I tried to resist the tortures.

2) Two or three times daily I had to stand against a wall, with my handcuffed hands held above the head, whereupon a Negro or the police-officer kept hitting me on my genitalia, with a leather whip up to a minute long. Whenever I made a resisting move with my handcuffed hands, I received a hit with the foot in my testicles. My testicles and genitalia were badly swollen.

3) Two or three times daily I had to open my mouth, whereupon the white police-officer or the Negroes spat into it. If I kept my mouth closed, it was forcefully opened with a wooden stick.

4) When I refused to drink from the piss-bowl in the toilet, I was hit with the whip.

5) On each of his visits to my cell, the white police-officer pulled hair from my nipples and eyebrows.

6) During the three days I received no nourishment, and only once I was allowed to drink water in the toilet. When I refused to take and to eat partially decayed leftovers from a cardboard box, I was pushed to the ground, a heavy iron chain was put on my back and I was forced to kiss the feet of the Negroes.

7) At the end of each torture, I had to put out with my bare feet burning cigarette butts, thrown on the ground.

On 26 May, I was brought to Wiesbaden in handcuffs, where I arrived in the early hours of 27 May. Only in Wiesbaden, the handcuffs which I had on since 22 May (five days) day and night were removed from my greatly swollen hands and infected joints. Since then I am under medical care. The officer in charge of the jail in Wiesbaden (he said he was a Jew) acted correctly.

[signed]

16.6.45 Julius Streicher

8) I was repeatedly photographed by people of the press, while wearing underpants and my genitalia were visible. The photographers were Jews.
9) On the last day, two hours before being transported to Wiesbaden, a Negro said: now comes "kill, kill" and made the corresponding gesture at the throat. He asked me what I wanted to eat or drink, I may wish. I asked for paper in order to write a letter to my wife.
10) Before being transported, a Negro called me into the toilet, then threw my civilian clothes in and ordered me to get dressed. This I had to do with handcuffed hands.

[redacted]

[redacted]

August 15, 1962

Mr. Charles Hamilton
200 West 57th Street
New York, N. Y. 10019

Re: STREICHER Document

Dear Mr. Hamilton:

As you know I left the seven pages of the above document at your office for the October 20th, 1962 auction.

I thought that perhaps you might want to know the circumstances under which I had obtained this item. During my work as interrogation officer at the Special Detention Center in Mondorf-les-Bains, Luxembourg in the summer of 1945, Julius Streicher was brought in to me for a routine interrogation. Streicher started to complain about his treatment in captivity. I gave him a pencil and paper and suggested that he put this on paper. I then proceeded with the interrogation. The following day Streicher requested to see me and brought in this seven page long complaint.

I believe that some time ago I gave you a copy of my "Military Biography" which further details my work at the "Ashcan" Detention Center for 48 top Nazis. If you will let me know, I will be glad to give you another copy of this should you want to read it for possible use in the catalogue. I expect to leave for our vacation on September 8th and return on October 4, 1962.

With best personal regards,

Sincerely,

[redacted]

[redacted]











5

Ende gedes Pri.
[illegible] sich auf dem
Boden zusammen brennende
Zigaretten[illegible] kaufte
zerstörte.

Am 26. Mai wurde ich,
gefesselt nach Wiesbaden transp.
portiert, wo ich in den ersten
Stunden des 27. Mai einige
Zeit mit Verhören [illegible]
[illegible] die
vom 22 Mai [illegible] 5 Tage,
[illegible] auf der Straße getragen
hatte, von den Kohlgesichtvol-
lenen Wachen u. Ostern den
Gefängnis genommen. Seitdem
befinde ich mich in der Unter-
suchungshaft. Der
Gefängnisdirektor in Wies-
baden ist sehr, er sei ein
Jude, ist sich korrekt ver-
halten.

Andreas Streicher
16.6.45





The Sleight-of-Hand of Simon Wiesenthal

"FALSO IN UNO, FALSO IN OMNIBUS"

For many years Simon Wiesenthal has made a highly successful career for himself as the world's foremost "Nazi hunter." The American mass media have elevated him to secular sainthood and the U.S. Congress awarded him a special gold medal.

In reality Wiesenthal is a proven liar. The most infamous example was his charge that an elderly Polish refugee living in Chicago, Frank Walus, was a Gestapo official responsible for killing Jews during the Second World War. Only a long and costly court battle by an unusually tenacious attorney saved Walus from almost certain death. The government prosecutors were forced to drop their case ignominiously. The popular Chicago *Weekly Reader* and the highly respected *Chicago Lawyer* published devastating exposés of Wiesenthal's role in the frame-up of Walus. Eventually even the Washington *Post* acknowledged his sordid role in the affair.

In Canada, the Toronto *Sun*, commenting on another "war criminal" case in which Wiesenthal was involved, and the accused finally determined to be innocent, editorialized: "It seems that material provided by professional Nazi hunter Simon Wiesenthal is wrong, but repeated [by the print and broadcast media] anyway."

Recently yet another example of Wiesenthal's blatant distortion of historical truth came to light.

In 1946 Wiesenthal published a book in Austria entitled *KZ Mauthausen* [Concentration Camp Mauthausen]. It consists mainly of mediocre sketches by the young "Nazi hunter" purporting to represent the horrors of the Mauthausen concentration camp. One of the drawings depicts three Mauthausen inmates bound to posts who had apparently been sadistically put to death by the Germans. Another graphic example of murderous Nazi treatment of inmates!

Actually, the sketch is completely phoney.

In January 1945 *Life* magazine published a series of photos graphically recording the firing-squad execution of three German soldiers who had been caught operating as spies behind the lines during the "Battle of the Bulge." Photographer Johnny Florea recorded the execution in December 1944 near Bastogne. The three soldiers died "singing patriotic German songs," *Life* reported.

In its issue of 16 December 1983 the West German weekly newspaper *Deutsche National-Zeitung* published the *Life* photos and the Wiesenthal sketch together. Even a quick comparison makes clear beyond any doubt that the "Nazi hunter" *had copied his drawing from the photographs*. Wiesenthal's gruesome depiction of German barbarism in Mauthausen is actually the deceitful product of his malicious mind.

Another example of the generally spurious character of Wiesenthal's 1946 Mauthausen book is his citation therein of the supposed "death bed" confession of Commandant Franz Ziereis that *four million* [sic] inmates were gassed to death at the Hartheim satellite camp. Along with Dachau, Ravensbrueck, and Buchenwald, "Holocaust" historians no longer even mention Mauthausen as a "death camp" or gassing center. According to the official tourist brochure now distributed at the camp, a total of only 206,000 persons *were ever inmates* at Mauthausen and its satellite camps.

Question: How long can a self-respecting world continue to even put up with, let alone shower honors on, this man Simon Wiesenthal—one of the biggest lying fakers of our age?

—*Mark Weber and Keith Stimely*

Above: "Life" magazine in January 1945 published these photos of three German soldiers shot by their American captors during the Battle of the Bulge.

Yes, Virginia: Wiesenthal Does Lie

Above: Simon Wiesenthal's drawing (from his book "KZ Mauthausen," 1946) depicting three murdered inmate victims of German barbarity in the concentration camp of Mauthausen. Note striped inmate garb on the figures. But did Wiesenthal really see this in Mauthausen? Compare this drawing and the three photos on the facing page and you will know what Wiesenthal drew from.

With all his talk about the "millions" of victims of Nazi brutality, why is it that Simon Wiesenthal couldn't seem to find any of those for his graphic depiction of such brutality? Why did he have to resort to copying from a scene of German victims of American execution?

Jesse Owens: Myth and Reality

Jesse Owens, the Black track and field star who won four gold medals at the 1936 Olympics in Berlin, died in 1980 at the age of 66. As so often during his lifetime, even this occasion was used by the major television networks and print media to spread slanderous falsehoods which have acquired wide acceptance through repetition over the years. With the naming of a Berlin street after Owens in March 1984, yet another opportunity was afforded for the fanfarish media dissemination of outrageous myths. Particularly idiotic and despicable was the report on *NBC Nightly News* of Sunday, 4 March.

The myths, which are usually asserted as fact, contend that German Chancellor Adolf Hitler was furious when Owens won; that Hitler refused to shake hands with Owens because he was Black; that the Germans were embarrassed because the Owens victory "disproved" German ideas about racial differences, and so on.

Actually, Owens was acclaimed by the Berliners as enthusiastically as any German. Owens himself said that on one occasion, while in the stadium, he caught sight of Hitler: "When I passed the Chancellor, he arose, waved his hand at me, and I waved back at him."

As for the alleged snubbing, the facts of the matter tell a story which is quite different than the one usually heard. Hitler was in his box on the first day of competition when Hans Woellke broke the Olympic record for the shot-put and, incidentally, became the first German to win an Olympic track and field championship. At Hitler's request, Woellke and the third place winner, another German, were lead to the box to receive personal congratulations from the Chancellor. Soon afterward Hitler personally greeted three Finns who won medals in the 10,000-meter run. Then he congratulated two German women who won first and second place in the women's javelin throw. The only other scheduled event that day was the high jump, which was running late. When all the German high-jumpers were eliminated, Hitler left the stadium in the dark as rain threatened and was not present to greet the three winners—all from the United States, and two of whom were Black.

Hitler left because it was late, not because he wanted to avoid greeting anyone. Besides, at the time he left Hitler could not know whether the final winners would be Black or White.

Count Baillet-Latour, president of the International Olympic Commission, sent word to the German leader that, as a guest of

honor at the Games, he should congratulate all or none. So when Jesse Owens won the final of the 100 meters the next day, he was not publicly greeted by Hitler—*nor were any other medal winners of that or any of the following events.*

Any notion that the Germans were "embarrassed" because of victories by non-Whites at the Berlin Games is ridiculous. Jesse Owens is very prominently featured in *Olympia*, the official German documentary of the Games. Leni Riefenstahl's film masterwork also devotes great attention to many other non-Whites, including outstanding Japanese athletes. The same holds true in the deluxe, semi-official German picture book commemorating the Games, *Die Olympischen Spiele 1936*, released by the Cigaretten-Bilderdienst. Jesse Owens is pictured seven times in this book—more than any other athlete—and is admiringly referred to as "the fastest in the world." A large picture in the book records the chiseling of the victors' names in granite at the stadium—and singled out in this picture is: "Owens U.S.A."

Despite the remarkable achievements of Jesse Owens, and of other athletes of all races, Germany did capture more gold medals than any other nation, thus "winning" the Olympics—a fact usually ignored in discussions of the 1936 Games.

In a letter of 14 March 1984 to the Director of West German ZDF television, former German athlete Walther Tripps protested the false report by a West German television network news announcer that Adolf Hitler did not publicly greet Owens because Owens was a Negro. Tripps was himself an outstanding relay runner at the 1936 Games. After sending his letter, Tripps further stated verbally that following the Games, Hitler invited all Olympic winners, including Owens, to a reception at the Reich Chancellory. Hitler personally congratulated and shook the hand of each winner, including Owens, who later confirmed this on several occasions. Following is the text of Tripps's letter:

To the
Director of the
ZDF [Second German Television]

Re: "Heute" ["Today"] news broadcast of 10 March 1984

As part of his report on the unveiling of the "Jesse-Owens-Allee" street sign in front of the Berlin Olympic Stadium, your announcer made an absolutely untrue statement. He repeated the stupid lie that in 1936 Adolf Hitler refused to meet the incomparable, four-time Olympic winner Jesse Owens because of his skin color and Negro ancestry. It seems that the announcer sought to clearly emphasize the so-called race hatred indoctrination.

This story is not just a fairy tale. It is a wretched lie. Today the truth is suppressed for presumably political reasons. But it will not

die. There are too many contemporary witnesses. I am one of them.

In fact, Adolf Hitler received and congratulated the German Olympic winners of the 1936 Games in the place of honor at the Olympic stadium. The 800,000 daily spectators, including many foreign visitors, enthusiastically applauded this. Dr. Gisela Mauermayer (now living in Munich), Tilly Fleischer-Grothe (now living in Lahr), Gerhard Stoeck (now living in Hamburg) and others were among those personally honored.

It was also arranged to honor the outstanding and unforgettable Jesse Owens in this way as well. But at this point the President of the International Olympic Committee, Count Baillet-Latour, stopped Hitler's plan by pointing out that this practice conflicted with the Committee rules. The Count, however, had no objectin to holding this kind of congratulatory reception in the Reich Chancellory.

Dr. Karl Ritter von Halt, then President of the German National Olympic Committee and head of the German athletic association, later confirmed these facts at a meeting of the former members of the German team. I was one of those present at this meeting in Stuttgart with the unforgettable Ritter von Halt, which took place shortly after his release from the Soviet-run Sachsenhausen concentration camp. (Among others, actor Heinrich George and Reich Trainer Dr. Nerz died there!) Also present were Borchmeyer (competitor in the final race against Owens, now living in Frankfurt), Blask, Hein, Tilly Fleischer, Dr. Gisela Mauermayer, Dr. Metzner, Hornberger, Stoeck, Syring, Dessecker, and many others. They are contemporary witnesses for fairness and truth.

The facts will be published in the magazine of the "Former German Winners' Sports Club." As National Olympic Committee President Daume rightly stated during the ceremony in Berlin, honor belongs to those who deserve it. Microphone personalities who spread lies do not belong on the television screen!

[signed]

Walther Tripps

To his credit, Jesse Owens himself never contributed to the myth-making. He repeatedly stressed the warmth of his reception in Germany and his happiness during those days in Berlin. But he couldn't prevent others from using him as a symbol, in life as well as in death, to slander Germany for motives of their own.

—*Mark Weber*

In Memoriam: Ranjan Borra

Historian, scholar, and journalist Ranjan Borra passed away on 13 February 1984 in Washington D.C. following a heart attack. He was 62.

Borra was born in Howrah, near Calcutta, in the Bengal province of India. He worked for All-India radio before moving to the United States in the 1950s. He was employed in Washington as a broadcaster and editor for the Voice of America. In 1962 he took a position with the Library of Congress, where he served as a senior reference librarian in the South Asia section until his death. Borra received a B.A. degree from American University and, in 1970, a Master's degree from the University of Maryland.

He will be remembered by many for his staunch devotion to the legacy of the great Indian political leader and freedom fighter, Subhas Chandra Bose. The twelve annual academic conferences organized by the Subhas Bose Society of Washington, which he founded and headed, attracted many leading scholars of South Asian history and won warm acclaim from the Indian government. In 1980 Borra presented a detailed review of the life and historical impact of Bose to the annual revisionist conference of the Institute for Historical Review. His paper, "Subhas Chandra Bose, The Indian National Army, and The War of India's Liberation," was published in the Winter 1982 issue of the *Journal of Historical Review*.

Although he lived in America for many years, Borra remained an Indian patriot until his death. He maintained close ties to his native land, returning often to visit. Borra was deeply disturbed by the basic structure of Indian society since independence. He felt strongly that the transplanted British political model of parliamentary democracy was alien and fundamentally unworkable. And he considered that, despite Ghandi's important contribution to Indian national freedom, the primitivist and pacifist Ghandian philosophy was utterly inapplicable to the country's pressing social, cultural, and economic problems. A vigorous program and outlook rooted in Indian values and traditions was needed, not an awkward amalgam of weak ideas borrowed from an alien culture. Borra firmly believed that the realistic vision and militant legacy of Subhas Bose was best suited to the needs of his native land.

Borra was a man of surprising talents. He contributed numerous articles on Asian political affairs to the weekly *Spotlight* and the daily *Washington Times* newspapers. He was a prize-winning amateur swimmer. An accomplished poet in both English

and his native Bengali, he participated in numerous poetry readings and conferences. He was a Bengali-language novelist. He was also a talented musician and singer. Some years ago the India Decca company issued a 45 rpm recording of his renditions of poems by Tagore.

I was fortunate to know Ranjan as a friend. We shared many interests and a common ideal. We often met in his office or for lunch at the Library of Congress. Ranjan was a warm and very perceptive man. He combined an exceptionally idealistic spirit with a firm sense of realism. During a highly productive lifetime, he always remained true to his lofty ideals. Ranjan Borra will be remembered with warmth and admiration by many.

—*Mark Weber*

About the Contributors

WILLIS A. CARTO founded the Institute for Historical Review in 1978, and serves as treasurer of Liberty Lobby, Inc., a Washington D.C. based citizens' lobbying group.

FRIEDRICH P. BERG is a mechanical engineer by profession. He received his B.S. in 1956 from the Columbia University School of Mines. He has worked as a technical writer and environmental consultant in the New York City area. Currently he is devoting himself to the study of the "Holocaust" claims from several technical points of view.

WILHELM STAEGLICH served as an antiaircraft artillery officer with the German army during World War II. He studied law and political science at the University of Rostock and the University of Goettingen, from where he received his doctorate in law (Dr. jur.) in 1951. He served for 20 years as a judge in Hamburg. He is the author of numerous articles on legal and historical subjects, and of the book *Der Auschwitz Mythos*, which has been banned from open sale in West Germany.

JAMES B. WHISKER holds a Ph.D. in government and politics from the University of Maryland. He is currently an Associate Professor of Political Science at West Virginia University. He is the author of *Essays in Political Science* (with H.N. Kim), *The Social, Political, and Religious Thought of Alfred Rosenberg*, and *National Socialist Ideology: Concepts and Ideas*.

RUDOLF JORDAN is a West German writer.

CHARLES LUTTON holds a M.A. degree in International Relations and a Ph.D in History. He teaches courses on the political and military history of the 20th Century, and is widely published in both scholarly and popular journals. He is associated with several leading policy think-tanks.

KEITH STIMELY is the editor of the *Journal of Historical Review*. He received his B.S. degree in History from the University of Oregon in 1980. He divides his time between working in Pennsylvania and researching in New York City.

MARK WEBER is a frequent contributor to *The JHR*. He received his M.A. in modern European History from Indiana University in 1977. He works in Washington D.C. as a writer, researcher, and translator.